00111900

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.

VOL. XLVI.

Godet's Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.

De 45

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1875.

PRINTED BY MURRAY AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.
DUBLIN, ... JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.
NEW YORK, ... SCRIBNER, WELFORD, AND ARMSTRONG.

A COMMENTARY

ON

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

BY

F. GODET,

DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL.

111900
ac.

VOLUME SECOND.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND FRENCH EDITION BY

M. D. CUSIN.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1875.

00111900

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO THE SECOND VOLUME.

FOURTH PART.

PAGE

THE JOURNEY FROM GALILEE TO JERUSALEM, IX. 51–XIX. 27, . . 1

First Cycle: The Departure from Galilee.—First Days of the Journey, ix. 51–xiii. 21, ... 9

Second Cycle: New Series of Incidents in the Journey, xiii. 22–xvii. 10, ... 123

Third Cycle: The Last Scenes in the Journey, xvii. 11–xix. 27, . 190

FIFTH PART.

THE SOJOURN AT JERUSALEM, XIX. 28–XXI. 38, . . . 226

First Cycle: The Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, xix. 28–44, . . 226

Second Cycle: The Reign of Jesus in the Temple, xix. 45–xxi. 4, . 233

Third Cycle: The Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem, xxi. 5–38, ... 256

SIXTH PART.

THE PASSION, XXII. AND XXIII., ... 277

First Cycle: The Preparation for the Passion, xxii. 1–46, . . 278

Second Cycle: The Passion, xxii. 47–xxiii. 46, . . . 308

Third Cycle: Close of the History of the Passion, xxiii. 47–56, . 339

Conclusion regarding the Day of Christ's Death, . . . 344

SEVENTH PART.

PAGE

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION, XXIV., ... 347

Of the Resurrection of Jesus, ... 361

Of the Ascension, ... 367

CONCLUSION.

CHAP. I.—The Characteristics of the Third Gospel, . . . 372

CHAP. II.—The Composition of the Third Gospel, . . . 401

CHAP. III.—The Sources of Luke, and the Relation of the Synoptics to one another, ... 422

CHAP. IV.—The Beginnings of the Church, ... 450

COMMENTARY ON ST. LUKE.

FOURTH PART.

JOURNEY FROM GALILEE TO JERUSALEM.

CHAP. IX. 51–XIX. 28.

A GREAT contrast marks the synoptical narrative: that between the ministry in Galilee, and the passion week at Jerusalem. According to Matthew (xix. 1–xx. 34) and Mark (chap. x.), the short journey from Capernaum to Judea through Perea forms the rapid transition between those two parts of the ministry of Jesus. Nothing, either in the distance between the places, or in the number of the facts related, would lead us to suppose that this journey lasted more than a few days. This will appear from the following table:

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
Conversation about divorce.	Same as Matt.	Wanting.
Presentation of the children.	*Id.*	Same as Matt.
The rich young man.	*Id.*	*Id.*
Parable of the labourers.	Wanting.	Wanting.
Third announcement of the passion.	Same as Matt.	Same as in Matt.
The request of Zebedee's sons.	*Id.*	Wanting.
Cure of the blind man of Jericho.	*Id.*	Same as Matt.
Wanting.	Wanting.	Zacchæus.
Id.	*Id.*	Parable of the pounds.

The fourth part of the Gospel of Luke, which begins at ix. 51, gives us a very different idea of what transpired at that period. Here we find the description of a slow and lengthened journey across the southern regions of Galilee, which border on Samaria. Jerusalem is, and remains, the fixed goal of the journey (ver. 51, xiii. 22, xvii. 11, etc.). But Jesus proceeds only by short

stages, stopping at each locality to preach the gospel. Luke does not say what direction He followed. But we may gather it from the first fact related by him. At the first step which He ventures to take with His followers on the Samaritan territory, He is stopped short by the ill-will excited against Him by national prejudice; so that even if His intention had been to repair directly to Jerusalem through Samaria (which we do not believe to have been the case), He would have been obliged to give up that intention, and turn eastward, in order to take the other route, that of Perea. Jesus therefore slowly approached the Jordan, with the view of crossing that river to the south of the lake Gennesaret, and of continuing His journey thereafter through Perea. The inference thus drawn from the narrative of Luke is positively confirmed by Matthew (xix. 1) and Mark (x. 1), both of whom indicate the Perean route as that which Jesus followed after His departure from Galilee. In this way the three synoptics coincide anew from Luke xviii. 15 onwards; and from the moment at which the narrative of Luke rejoins the two others, we have to regard the facts related by him as having passed in Perea. This slow journeying, first from west to east across southern Galilee, then from north to south through Perea, the description of which fills ten whole chapters, that is to say, more than a third of Luke's narrative, forms in this Gospel a real section intermediate between the two others (the description of the Galilean ministry and that of the passion week); it is a *third* group of narratives corresponding in importance to the two others so abruptly brought into juxtaposition in Mark and Matthew, and which softens the contrast between them.

But can we admit with certainty the historical reality of this evangelistic journey in southern Galilee, which forms one of the characteristic features of the third Gospel? Many modern critics refuse to regard it as historical. They allege:

1. The entire absence of any analogous account in Matthew and Mark. Matthew, indeed, relates only two solitary facts (Matt. viii. 19 et seq. and xii. 21 et seq.) of all those which Luke describes in the ten chapters of which this section consists, up to the moment when the three narratives again become parallel (Luke xviii. 14); Mark, not a single one.

2. The visit of Jesus to Martha and Mary, which Luke

puts in this journey (x. 38–42), can have taken place only in Judea, at Bethany; likewise the saying, xiii. 34, 35, cannot well have been uttered by Jesus elsewhere than at Jerusalem in the temple (Matt. xxiii. 37–39). Do not these errors of time and place cast a more than suspicious light on the narrative of the entire journey? M. Sabatier himself, who thoroughly appreciates the important bearing of this narrative in Luke on the harmony of the four Gospels, nevertheless goes the length of saying: "We see with how many contradictions and material impossibilities this narrative abounds."[1]

It has been attempted to defend Luke, by alleging that he did not *mean* to relate a journey, and that this section was only a collection of doctrinal utterances arranged in the order of their subjects, and intended to show the marvellous wisdom of Jesus. It is impossible for us to admit this explanation, with Luke's own words before us, which express and recall from time to time his intention of describing a consecutive journey: ix. 51, "He stedfastly set His face *to go to Jerusalem;*" xiii. 22, "He was going through the cities and villages . . . *journeying toward Jerusalem;*" xvii. 11 (lit. trans.), "And it came to pass, *as He went to Jerusalem*, that He traversed the country between Samaria and Galilee."

Wieseler, taking up an entirely opposite point of view, finds in those three passages the indications of as many individual journeys, which he connects with three journeys to Jerusalem placed by John almost at the same epoch. It is hoped in this way to find the point of support for Luke's narrative in the fourth Gospel, which is wanting to it in the two first. The departure mentioned ix. 51 would correspond with the journey of Jesus, John vii. 1–x. 39 (feast of Tabernacles and of Dedication), a journey which terminates in a sojourn in Perea (John x. 40 et seq.). The mention of a journey xiii. 22 would refer to the journey from Perea to Bethany for the raising of Lazarus, John xi., after which Jesus repairs to Ephraim. Finally, the passage xvii. 11 would correspond with the journey from Ephraim to Jerusalem for the last Passover (John xi. 55). It would be necessary to admit that Jesus, after His Ephraim sojourn, made a last

[1] *Essai sur les Sources de la Vie de Jésus*, p. 29.

visit to Galilee, proceeding thither through Samaria (Wieseler translates Luke xvii. 11 as in E. V., "through the midst of Samaria and Galilee"), then that He returned to Judea through Perea (Matt. xix.; Mark x.).

We cannot allow that this view has the least probability. —1. Those three passages in Luke plainly do not indicate, in his mind at least, three different departures and journeys. They are way-marks set up by the author on the route of Jesus, in the account of this unique journey, by which he recalls from time to time the general situation described ix. 51, on account of the slowness and length of the progress.— 2. The departure (ix. 51) took place, as the sending of the seventy disciples proves, with the greatest publicity; it is not therefore identical with the departure (John vii. 1 et seq.), which took place, *as it were, in secret;* Jesus undoubtedly did not then take with Him more than one or two of His most intimate disciples. — 3. The interpretation which Wieseler gives of xvii. 11 appears to us inadmissible (see the passage). — It must therefore be acknowledged, not only that Luke meant in those ten chapters to relate a journey, but that he meant to relate one, and *only one.*

Others think that he intended to produce in the minds of his readers the idea of a continuous journey, but that this is a framework of fiction which has no corresponding reality. De Wette and Bleek suppose that, after having finished his account of the Galilean ministry, Luke still possessed a host of important materials, without any determinate localities or dates, and that, rather than lose them, he thought good to insert them here, between the description of the Galilean ministry and that of the passion, while grouping them in the form of a recorded journey. Holtzmann takes for granted that those materials were nothing else than the contents of his second principal source, the *Logia* of Matthew, which Luke has placed here, after employing up till this point his first source, the original Mark. Weizsäcker, who thinks, on the contrary, that the *Logia* of Matthew are almost exactly reproduced in the great groups of discourses which the first contains, sees in this fourth part of Luke a collection of sayings derived by him from those great discourses of Matthew, and arranged systematically with regard to the principal

questions which were agitated in the apostolic churches (the account of the feast, xiv. 1–35, alluding to the Agapæ; the discourses, xv. 1–xvii. 10, to questions relative to the admission of Gentiles, etc.).

Of course, according to those three points of view, the historical introductions with which Luke prefaces each of those teachings would be more or less his own invention. He deduces them himself from those teachings, as we might do at the present day. As to the rest, Bleek expressly remarks that this view leaves entirely intact the historical truth of the sayings of Jesus in themselves. We shall gather up in the course of our exegesis the data which can enlighten us on the value of those hypotheses; but at the outset we must offer the following observations:—1. In thus inventing an entire phase of the ministry of Jesus, Luke would put himself in contradiction to the programme marked out (i. 1–4), where he affirms that he has endeavoured to reproduce historical truth exactly.—2. What purpose would it serve knowingly to enrich the ministry of Jesus with a fictitious phase? Would it not have been much simpler to distribute those different pieces along the course of the Galilean ministry? —3. Does a conscientious historian play thus with the matter of which he treats, especially when that matter forms the object of his religious faith?—If Luke had really acted in this way, we should require, with Baur, to take a step further, and ascribe to this fiction a more serious intention—that of establishing, by those prolonged relations of Jesus to the Samaritans, the Pauline universalism? Thus it is that criticism, logically carried out in questions relating to the Gospels, always lands us in this dilemma—historical truth or deliberate imposture.

The historical truth of this journey, as Luke describes it, appears to us evident from the following facts:—1. Long or short, a journey from Galilee to Judea through Perea must have taken place; so much is established by the narratives of Matthew and Mark, and indirectly confirmed by that of John, when he mentions a sojourn in Perea precisely at the same epoch (x. 40–42).—2. The *duration* of this journey must have been much more considerable than appears from a hasty glance at the first two synoptics. How, in reality, are we to

fill the six or seven months which separated the feast of Tabernacles (John vii., month of October) from that of the Passover, at which Jesus died? The few accounts, Matt. xix. and xx. (Mark x.), cannot cover such a gap. Scarcely is there wherewith to fill up the space of a week. Where, then, did Jesus pass all that time? And what did He do? It is usually answered, that from the feast of Tabernacles to that of the Dedication (December) He remained in Judea. That is not possible. He must have gone to Jerusalem in a sort of *incognito* and by way of surprise, in order to appear unexpectedly in that city, and to prevent the police measures which a more lengthened sojourn in Judea would have allowed His enemies to take against Him. And after the violent scenes related John vii. 1–x. 21, He must have remained peacefully there for more than two whole months! Such an idea is irreconcilable with the situation described John vi. 1 and vii. 1–13.

Jesus therefore, immediately after rapidly executing that journey, returned to Galilee. This return, no doubt, is not mentioned; but no more is that which followed John v. It is understood, as a matter of course, that so long as a new scene of action is not indicated in the narrative, the old one continues. After the stay at Jerusalem at the feast of Dedication (John x. 22 et seq.), it is expressly said that Jesus sojourned in Perea (vers. 40–42): there we have the first indication apprising us that the long sojourn in Galilee had come to an end. Immediately, therefore, after the feast of Tabernacles, Jesus returned to Galilee, and it was then that He definitely bade adieu to that province, and set out, as we read Luke ix. 51, to approach Jerusalem slowly and while preaching the gospel. Not only is such a journey possible, but it is in a manner forced on us by the necessity of providing contents for that blank interval in the ministry of Jesus.—3. The indications which Luke supplies respecting the *scene* of this journey have nothing in them but what is exceedingly probable. After His first visit to Nazareth, Jesus settled at Capernaum; He made it *His own city* (Matt. ix. 1), and the centre of His excursions (Luke iv. 31 et seq.). Very soon He considerably extended the radius of His journeys on the side of western Galilee (Nain, vii. 11). Then He quitted

His Capernaum residence, and commenced a ministry purely itinerant (viii. 1 et seq.). To this period belong His first visit to Decapolis, to the east of the lake of Gennesaret, and the multiplication of the loaves, to the north-east of that sea. Finally, we learn from Matthew and Mark that Jesus made two other great excursions into the northern regions, — the one to the north-west toward Phœnicia (Luke's great lacuna), the other toward the north-east, to the sources of the Jordan (Cæsarea Philippi, and the transfiguration). To accomplish His mission toward Galilee there thus remained to be visited only the southern parts of this province on the side of Samaria. What more natural, consequently, than the direction which He followed in this journey, slowly passing over that southern part of Galilee from west to east which He had not before visited, and from which He could make some excursions among that Samaritan people at whose hands He had found so eager a welcome at the beginning of His ministry?

Regarding the visit to Martha and Mary, and the saying xiii. 34, 35, we refer to the explanation of the passages. Perhaps the first is a trace (unconscious on the part of Luke) of Jesus' short sojourn at Jerusalem at the feast of Dedication. In any case, the narrative of Luke is thus found to form the natural transition between the synoptical accounts and that of John. And if we do not find in Luke that multiplicity of journeys to Jerusalem which forms the distinctive feature of John's Gospel, we shall at least meet with the intermediate type of a ministry, a great part of which (the Galilean work once finished) assumes the form of a prolonged pilgrimage in the direction of Jerusalem.

As to the contents of the ten chapters embraced in this part of Luke, they are perfectly in keeping with the situation. Jesus carries along with Him to Judea all the following of devoted believers which He has found in Galilee, the nucleus of His future Church. From this band will go forth the army of evangelists which, with the apostles at its head, will shortly enter upon the conquest of the world in His name. To prepare them as they travel along for this task,—such is His constant aim. He prosecutes it directly in two ways: by sending them on a mission before Him, as formerly He had sent the twelve, and making them serve, as these had done, a

first apprenticeship to their future work; then, by bringing to bear on them the chief part of His instructions respecting that emancipation from the world and its goods which was to be the distinctive character of the life of His servants, and thus gaining them wholly for the great task which He allots to them.[1]

What are the sources of Luke in this part which is peculiar to him? According to Holtzmann, Luke here gives us the contents of Matthew's *Logia*, excepting the introductions, which he adds or amplifies. We shall examine this whole hypothesis hereafter. According to Schleiermacher, this narrative is the result of the combination of two accounts derived from the journals of two companions of Jesus, the one of whom took part in the journey at the feast of Dedication, the other in that of the last Passover. Thus he explains the exactness of the details, and at the same time the apparent inexactness with which a visit to Bethany is found recorded in the midst of a series of scenes in Galilee. According to this view, the short introductions placed as headings to the discourses are worthy of special confidence.—But how has this fusion of the two writings which has merged the two journeys into one been brought about? Luke cannot have produced it consciously; it must have existed in his sources. The difficulty is only removed a stage. How was it possible for the two accounts of different journeys to be fused into a

[1] We cannot help recalling here the admirable picture which Eusebius draws of the body of evangelists who, under Trajan, continued the work of those whom Jesus had trained with so much care: "Alongside of him (Quadratus) there flourished at that time many other successors of the apostles, who, admirable disciples of those great men, reared the edifice on the foundations which they laid, continuing the work of preaching the gospel, and scattering abundantly over the whole earth the wholesome seed of the heavenly kingdom. For a very large number of His disciples, carried away by fervent love of the truth which the divine word had revealed to them, fulfilled the command of the Saviour to divide their goods among the poor. Then, taking leave of their country, they filled the office of evangelists, coveting eagerly to preach Christ, and to carry the glad tidings of God to those who had not yet heard the word of faith. And after laying the foundations of the faith in some remote and barbarous countries, establishing pastors among them, and confiding to them the care of those young settlements, without stopping longer, they hasted on to other nations, attended by the grace and virtue of God" (ed. Lœmmer, iii. 38). Such were the spiritual children of those whom Jesus had equipped on this journey, which some have reckoned an invention of Luke.

unique whole? As far as we are concerned, all that we believe it possible to say regarding the source from which Luke drew is, that the document must have been either Aramaic, or translated from Aramaic. To be convinced of this, we need only read the verse, ix. 51, which forms the heading of the narrative.

If we were proceeding on the relation of Luke to the two other synoptics, we should divide this part into two cycles, —that in which Luke moves alone (ix. 51–xviii. 14), and that in which he moves parallel to them (xviii. 15–xix. 27). But that division has nothing corresponding to it in the mind of the author, who probably knows neither of the two other canonical accounts. He himself divides his narrative into three cycles by the three observations with which he marks it off: 1*st.* ix. 51–xiii. 21 (ix. 51, the *resolution* to depart); 2*d.* xiii. 22–xvii. 10 (xiii. 22, the *direction* of the journey); 3*d.* xvii. 11–xix. 27 (xvii. 11, the *scene* of the journey). Such, then, will be our division.

FIRST CYCLE.—CHAP. IX. 51–XIII. 21.

The Departure from Galilee.—First Period of the Journey.

1. *Unfavourable Reception by the Samaritans:* ix. 51–56.—Ver. 51. *Introduction.*—The style of this verse is peculiarly impressive and solemn. The expressions ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἐστήριξε πρόσωπον στηρίζειν betray an Aramaic original. The verb συμπληροῦσθαι, *to be fulfilled,* means here, as in Acts ii. 1, the gradual filling up of a series of days which form a complete period, and extend to a goal determined beforehand; comp. πλησθῆναι, ii. 21, 22. The period here is that of the days of the departing of Jesus from this world; it began with the first announcement of His sufferings, and it had now reached one of its marked epochs, the departure from Galilee. The goal is the ἀνάληψις, *the perfecting* of Jesus; this expression combines the two ideas of His death and ascension. Those two events, of which the one is the complement of the other, form together the consummation of His return to the Father; comp. the same combination of ideas in ὑψωθῆναι

and *ὑπάγειν*, John iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32, xiii. 3. For the plural *ἡμέραι*, Luke i. 21, 22.—Wieseler (in his *Synopsis*) formerly gave to *ἀνάληψις* the meaning of *good reception*: "When the time of the favourable reception which He had found in Galilee was coming to an end." But as this meaning would evidently require some such definition as *ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ*, he now understands by *ἡμέρ. ἀναλ.*, "the days during which Jesus should have been received by men" (*Beiträge*, etc., p. 127 et seq.). But how can we give to a substantive the meaning of a verb in the conditional? and besides, comp. Acts i. 2, which fixes the meaning of *ἀνάληψις*. On the other hand, when Meyer concludes from the passage in Acts that the ascension only is here referred to, he forgets the difference of context. In Acts i. this meaning is evident, the death being already a past event; but here it is difficult to believe that the two events yet to come, by which the departure of Jesus to heaven (*ἀνάληψις*) was to be consummated, are not comprehended in this word.—The pronoun *αὐτός*, by emphasizing the subject, brings into prominence the free and deliberate character of this departure. On the *καί* of the apodosis, see vol. i. pp. 133, 136. This *καί* (*and* He *also*) recalls the correspondence between the divine decree implied in the term *συμπληροῦσθαι*, *to be fulfilled*, and the free will with which Jesus conforms thereto. The phrase *πρόσωπον στηρίζειν* corresponds in the LXX. to שום פנים (Jer. xxi. 10) or נתן פנים (Ezek. vi. 2), *dresser sa face vers* (Ostervald), to give one's view an invariable direction towards an end. The expression supposes a fear to be surmounted, an energy to be displayed.—On the prepositional phrase *to Jerusalem*, comp. ix. 31 and Mark x. 32: "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and as they followed they were afraid." To start for Jerusalem is to march to His death; Jesus knows it; the disciples have a presentiment of danger. This confirms our interpretation of *ἀνάληψις*.

Vers. 52–56.[1] *The Refusal.*—This tentative message of

[1] Ver. 52. ℵ. Γ. Δ. 24 Mnn. It. Vg. read *πολιν* instead of *κωμην*.—Ver. 54. ℵ. B. some Mnn. omit *αυτου* after *μαθηται*.—ℵ. B. L. Z. 2 Mnn. It$^{alliq.}$ Syr$^{cur.}$ omit the words *ως και Ηλιας εποιησεν*.—Ver. 55. ℵ. A. B. C. E. G. H. L. S. V. X. Δ. Z. 64 Mnn. omit the words *και ειπεν ουκ οιδατε οιου πνευματος εστε υμεις*, which are found

Jesus does not prove, as Meyer and Bleek think, that He had the intention of penetrating farther into Samaria, and of going directly to Jerusalem in that way. He desired to do a work in the north of that province, like that which had succeeded so admirably in the south (John iv.).

The sending of messengers was indispensable, on account of the numerous retinue which accompanied Him. The reading πόλιν (ver. 52), though less supported, appears to us preferable to the reading κώμην, which is probably taken from ver. 56.—In general, the Samaritans put no obstacle in the way of Jews travelling through their country. It was even by this route, according to Josephus, that the Galileans usually went to Jerusalem; but Samaritan toleration did not go so far as to offer hospitality. The aim of Jesus was to remove the wall which for long centuries had separated the two peoples.—The Hebraism, τὸ πρόσωπον πορευόμενον (ver. 53), פנים הלכים (Ex. xxxiii. 14; 2 Sam. xvii. 11), proves an Aramaic document.—The conduct of James and John betrays a state of exaltation, which was perhaps still due to the impression produced by the transfiguration scene. The proposal which they make to Jesus seems to be related to the recent appearance of Elias. This remark does not lose its truth, even if the words, *as did Elias,* which several Alex. omit, are not authentic.

Perhaps this addition was meant to extenuate the fault of the disciples; but it may also have been left out to prevent the rebuke of Jesus from falling on the prophet, or because the Gnostics employed this passage against the authority of the O. T. (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 23). The most natural supposition after all is, that the passage is an explanatory gloss.—Is the surname of *sons of thunder,* given by Jesus to James and John, to be dated from this circumstance? We think not. Jesus would not have perpetuated the memory of a fault committed by His two beloved disciples.—The phrase, *He turned* (ver. 55), is explained by the fact that Jesus was walking at the head of the company.—A great many Alex. in D. F^{w}. K. M. U. Γ. Δ. Π. the majority of the Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}.—Ver. 56. The T. R. adds at the beginning of the verse: ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σῶσαι, following F^{w}. K. M. U. Γ. Δ. Π. almost all the Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}. These words are omitted in the other 14 Mjj. 65 Mnn. It^{aliq}.

and Byz. MSS. agree in rejecting the last words of this verse, *And said, Ye know not;* but the oldest versions, the *Itala* and *Peschito,* confirm its authenticity; and it is probable that the cause of the omission is nothing else than the confounding of the words *KAI EME* with the following *KAI EΠορεύθη.* They may be understood in three ways: either interrogatively, "Know ye not what is the new spiritual reign which I bring in, and of which you are tô be the instruments, that of meekness?"—or affirmatively, with the same sense, "Ye know not yet . . ." The third meaning is much more severe: "Ye know not of what spirit you are the instruments when speaking thus; you think that you are working a miracle of faith in my service, but you are obeying a spirit alien from mine." This last meaning, which is that of St. Augustine and of Calvin, is more in keeping with the expression ἐπετίμησεν, *He rebuked them.*

The following words (ver. 56), *For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them,* are wanting in the same authorities as the preceding, and in the *Cantabrigian* besides. It is a gloss brought in from xix. 10 and Matt. xviii. 11. In these words there are, besides, numerous variations, as is usual in interpolated passages. Here, probably, we have the beginning of those many alterations in the text which are remarked in this piece. The copyists, rendered distrustful by the first gloss, seem to have taken the liberty of making arbitrary corrections in the rest of the passage. The suspicion of Gnostic interpolations may have equally contributed to the same result.

Jesus offered, but did not impose Himself (viii. 37); He withdrew. Was the other village where He was received Jewish or Samaritan? Jewish, most probably; otherwise the difference of treatment experienced in two villages belonging to the same people would have been more expressly emphasized.

2. *The Three Disciples:* ix. 57–62.—Two of these short episodes are also connected in Matthew (chap. viii.); but by him they are placed at the time when Jesus is setting out on His excursion into Decapolis. Meyer and Weizsäcker prefer the situation indicated by Matthew. The sequel will show what we are to think of that opinion.

1*st.* Vers. 57 and 58.[1]—Luke says, *a certain man;* in Matthew it is a scribe. Why this difference, if they follow the same document?—The homage of the man breathed a blind confidence in his own strength. The answer of Jesus is a call to self-examination. To follow such a Master *whithersoever He goeth,* more is needed than a good resolution; he must walk in the way of self-mortification (ix. 23).[2] The word κατασκήνωσις strictly denotes shelter under foliage, as opposed to holes in the earth. Night by night Jesus received from the hand of His Father a resting-place, which He knew not in the morning; the beasts were better off in respect of comfort. The name *Son of man* is employed with precision here to bring out the contrast between the Lord of creation and His poorest subjects.—This offer and answer are certainly put more naturally at the time of final departure from Galilee, than at the beginning of a few hours' or a few days' excursion, as in Matthew.

2*d.* Vers. 59, 60.[3]—Luke says, *another* (individual); Matthew, *another of His disciples.*—The scribe had offered himself; this latter is addressed by Jesus. Luke alone indicates the contrast which the succeeding conversation explains. Here we have no more a man of impulse, presumptuous and without self-distrust. On the contrary, we have a character reflecting and wary even to excess. Jesus has more confidence in him than in the former; He stimulates instead of correcting him.—Could the answer which He gives him (ver. 60) be altogether justified in the situation which Matthew indicates, and if what was contemplated was only a short expedition, in which this man without inconvenience could have taken part? In the position indicated by Luke, the whole aspect of the matter changes. The Lord is setting out, not again to return; will he who remains behind at this decisive moment ever rejoin Him? There are critical periods in the moral life, when that which is not done

[1] Ver. 57. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit κυριε.

[2] The following is M. Renan's commentary on this saying: "His vagrant life, at first full of charms for him, began to weigh heavily on him" (*Vie de Jésus,* 13th ed. p. 337). Here certainly is one of the strangest liberties with the history of Jesus which this author has allowed himself. The saying breathes, on the contrary, the most manly courage.

[3] Ver. 59. B. D. V. omit κυριε.

at the moment will never be done. The Spirit blows; its action over, the ship will never succeed in getting out of port. But, it is said, to bury a father is a sacred duty; Jesus has no right to set aside such a duty. But there may be conflicting duties; the law itself provided for one, in cases analogous to that which is before us. The high priest and the Nazarites, or *consecrated ones*, were not to pollute themselves for the dead, were it even their father or mother (Lev. xxi. 11; Num. vi. 6, 7); that is to say, they could neither touch the body to pay it the last duties, nor enter the house where it lay (Num. xix. 14), nor take part in the funeral meal (Hos. ix. 4). All that Jesus does here is to apply the moral principle implicitly laid down by the law,—to wit, that in case of conflict, spiritual duty takes precedence of the law of propriety. If his country be attacked, a citizen will leave his father's body to run to the frontier; if his own life be threatened, the most devoted son will take to flight, leaving to others the care of paying the last honours to his father's remains. Jesus calls upon this man to do for the life of his soul what every son would do for that of his body. It must be remembered that the pollution contracted by the presence of a dead body lasted seven days (Num. xix. 11–22). What would have happened to this man during these seven days? His impressions would have been chilled. Already Jesus saw him plunged anew in the tide of his ordinary life, lost to the kingdom of God. There was needed in this case a decision like that which Jesus had just taken Himself (ver. 51). Ἀπελθών (strictly, *from the spot*) is opposed to every desire of delay; the higher mission, the spiritual Nazariteship, begins immediately. From the word *dead*, on the double meaning of which the answer of Jesus turns, there is suggested the judgment which He passed on human nature before its renewal by the gospel. This saying is parallel to that other, "*If ye who are evil . . .*," and to Paul's declaration, "*Ye were dead in your sins . . .*" (Eph. ii. 1). The command, "*Preach the kingdom of God*," justifies, by the sublimity of the object, the sacrifice demanded. The διά in διάγγελλε indicates diffusion. The mission of the seventy disciples, which immediately follows, sets this command in its true light. Jesus had a place for this man to fill in that

army of evangelists which He purposed to send before Him, and which at a later date was to labour in changing the aspect of the world. Everything in this scene is explained by the situation in which Luke places it.—Clement of Alexandria relates (*Strom.* iii. 4) that the name of this man was Philip. In any case, it could not have been the apostle of that name who had long been following Jesus (John vi.); but might it not be the deacon Philip, who afterwards played so important a part as deacon and evangelist in the primitive Church? If it is so, we can understand why Jesus did not allow such a prize to escape Him.

3d. Vers. 61, 62.—This third instance belongs only to Luke. It is, as it were, the synthesis of the two others. This man offers himself, like the first; and yet he temporizes like the second. The word ἀποτάσσεσθαι, strictly, *to leave one's place in the ranks*, rather denotes here separation from the members of his house, than renunciation of his goods (xiv. 33). The preposition εἰς, which follows τοῖς, is better explained by taking the pronoun in the masculine sense.—There are, in the answer of Jesus, at once a call to examine himself, and a summons to a more thorough decision. The figure is that of a man who, while engaged in labour (aor. ἐπιβαλών), instead of keeping his eye on the furrow which he is drawing (pres. βλέπων), looks behind at some object which attracts his interest. He is only half at work, and half work only will be the result. What will come of the divine work in the hands of a man who devotes himself to it with a heart preoccupied with other cares? A heroic impulse, without afterthought, is the condition of Christian service.—In the words, *fit for the kingdom of God*, the two ideas of self-discipline and of work to influence others are not separated, as indeed they form but one. This summons to entire renunciation is much more naturally explained by the situation of Luke than by that of Matthew.

Those three events had evidently been joined together by tradition, on account of their homogeneous nature, like the two Sabbatic scenes, vi. 1–11. They were examples of the discriminating wisdom with which Jesus treated the most diverse cases. This group of episodes was incorporated by the evangelists of the primitive Church in either of the traditional cycles indifferently. Accordingly, in

Matthew it takes its place in the cycle of the Gadarene journey. Luke, more exact in his researches, has undoubtedly restored it to its true historical situation. For although the three events did not occur at the same time, as might appear to be the case if we were to take his narrative literally, all the three nevertheless belong to the same epoch, that of the final departure from Galilee. Holtzmann, who will have it that Matthew and Luke both borrowed this piece from the *Logia*, is obliged to ask why Matthew has cut off the third case? His answer is: Matthew imagined that this third personage was no other than the rich young man whose history he reckoned on giving later, in the form in which he found it in the other common source, the original Mark. Luke had not the same perspicacity; and hence he has twice related the same fact in two different forms. But the rich young man had no thought of asking Jesus to be allowed to follow Him; what filled his mind was the idea of some work to be done which would secure his salvation. The state of soul and the conversation are wholly different. At all events, if the fact was the same, it would be more natural to allow that it had taken two different forms in the tradition, and that Luke, not having the same sources as Matthew, reproduced both without suspecting their identity.

3. *The Sending of the Seventy Disciples:* x. 1–24.— Though Jesus proceeded slowly from city to city, and from village to village, He had but little time to devote to each place. It was therefore of great moment that He should everywhere find His arrival prepared for, minds awakened, hearts expectant of His visit. This precaution was the more important, because this first visit was to be His last. Accordingly, as He had sent the Twelve into the northern parts of Galilee at the period when He was visiting them for the last time, He now summons a more numerous body of His adherents to execute a similar mission in the southern regions of the province. They thus serve under His eyes, in a manner, the apprenticeship to their future calling. The recital of this mission embraces—1*st*, The Sending (vers. 1–16); 2*d*, The Return (vers. 17–24). The essential matter always is the discourse of Jesus, in which His profoundest emotions find expression.

1*st. The Sending*, vers. 1–16.—Ver. 1.[1] *The Mission.*—*Ἀναδείκνυμι, to put in view;* and hence, *to elect* and *install* (i. 80);

[1] Ver. 1. B. L. Z. Syr^{sch}. omit *καὶ*.—B. D. M. Syr^{cur}. It^{aliq}. Epiphanius, Augustine, Recognit. Clement.: *ἐβδομήκοντα δύο*.—B. K. Π. some Mnn. Syr., *δύο δύο* instead of *δύο*.

here, *to designate.* The word *instituer* (Crampon) would wrongly give a permanent character to this mission. Schleiermacher and Meyer think that by the καὶ ἑτέρους, *others also,* Luke alludes to the sending of the two messengers (ix. 52). But those two envoys are of too widely different a nature to admit of being put on the same footing, and the term ἀνέδειξεν could not be applied to the former. The solemn instructions which follow leave no room to doubt, that by the *others also,* Luke alludes to the sending of the Twelve. The term ἑτέρους, *others,* authorizes the view that the Twelve were not comprehended in this second mission; Jesus kept them at this time by His side, with a view to their peculiar training for their future ministry.

The oscillation which prevails in the MSS. between the numbers *seventy* and *seventy-two,* and which is reproduced in ver. 17, exists equally in several other cases where this number appears, *e.g.* the seventy or seventy-two Alexandrine translators of the Old Testament. This is due to the fact that the numbers 70 and 72 are both multiples of numbers very frequently used in sacred symbolism—7 times 10 and 6 times 12. The authorities are in favour of *seventy,* the reading in particular of the *Sinaïticus.* Does this number contain an allusion to that of the members of the Sanhedrim (71, including the president),—a number which appears in its turn to correspond with that of the 70 elders chosen by Moses (Num. xi. 16-25)? In this case it would be, so to speak, an anti-Sanhedrim which Jesus constituted, as, in naming the Twelve, He had set over against the twelve sons of Jacob twelve new spiritual patriarchs. But there is another explanation of the number which seems to us more natural. The Jews held, agreeably to Gen. x., that the human race was made up of 70 (or 72) peoples, 14 descended from Japhet, 30 from Ham, and 26 from Shem. This idea, not uncommon in the writings of later Judaism, is thus expressed in the *Clementine Recognitions* (ii. 42): "God divided all the nations of the earth into 72 parts." If the choice of the Twelve, as it took place at the beginning, had more particular relation to Christ's mission to Israel, the sending of the seventy, carried out at a more advanced epoch, when the unbelief of the people was assuming a fixed form, announced and prepared for the extension of

preaching throughout the whole earth.—Jesus sent them two and two; the gifts of the one were to complete those of the other. Besides, did not the legal adage say, *In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established?*—Lange translates *οὗ ἔμελλεν*, "where He *should have come*," as if the end of the visit made by the seventy had been to make up for that for which Jesus had not time. This meaning is opposed to the text, and particularly to the words *before Him.*

Vers. 2–16. *The Discourse.*—It falls into two parts: Instructions for the mission (vers. 2–12), and warnings to the cities of Galilee (vers. 13–16).

The instructions first explain the reason of this mission (ver. 2); then the conduct to be observed on setting out and during the journey (vers. 3, 4), at the time of arrival (vers. 5, 6); during their sojourn in the case of a favourable reception (vers. 7–9); finally, on their departure in the case of rejection (vers. 10–12).

Ver. 2.[1]—"*Therefore said He unto them, The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth labourers into His harvest.*" Matthew has this utterance in chap. ix., in presence of the Galilean multitudes, and as an introduction to the sending of the Twelve. Bleek himself acknowledges that it is better placed by Luke. "*The field is the world,*" Jesus had said in the parable of the sower. It is to this vast domain that the very strong words of this verse naturally apply, recalling the similar words, John iv. 35: "*Look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest,*" uttered in Samaria, and on the threshold, as it were, of the Gentile world. The sending of the new labourers is the fruit of the prayers of their predecessors. The prep. *ἐκ* in *ἐκβάλλειν, thrust forth,* may signify, forth from the Father's house, from heaven, whence real callings issue; or, forth from the Holy Land, whence the evangelization of the Gentiles was to proceed. Following on the idea of prayer, the first meaning is the more natural.

Vers. 3, 4.[2]—"*Go your ways; behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes:*

[1] Ver. 2. Instead of *οὖν*, ℵ. B. C. D. L. Z. some Mnn. It[allq.] read *δέ*.

[2] Ver. 3. ℵ. A. B. omit *ἐγω* after *ἰδου*.—Ver. 4. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. several Mnn., *μη* instead of *μηδέ*.

and salute no man by the way." They are to set out just as they are, weak and utterly unprovided. The first characteristic of the messengers of Jesus is confidence. Jesus, who gives them their mission (ἐγώ is certainly authentic), charges Himself with the task of defending them and of providing for their wants.—Ὑποδήματα, *change* of sandals; this is proved by the verb βαστάζειν, to carry a burden.—It is difficult to understand the object of the last words. Are they meant to indicate haste, as in 2 Kings iv. 29? But the journey of Jesus Himself has nothing hurried about it. Does He mean to forbid them, as some have thought, to seek the favour of men? But the words *by the way* would be superfluous. Jesus rather means that they must travel like men absorbed by one supreme interest, which will not permit them to lose their time in idle ceremonies. It is well known how complicated and tedious eastern salutations are. The domestic hearth is the place where they are to deliver their message. A tranquillity reigns there which is appropriate to so serious a subject. The following verses readily fall in with this idea.

Vers. 5, 6.[1] "*And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the* (*a*) *son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again.*" —The pres. εἰσέρχησθε (Byz.) expresses better than the aor. (Alex.) that the entrance and the salutation are simultaneous. The prevailing impulse, in the servant of Christ, is the desire of communicating the peace with which he himself is filled (*his peace,* ver. 6). — If the article before υἱὸς — "*the* son of peace"—were authentic (T. R.), it would designate the individual as the object of a special divine decree, which is far-fetched. The phrase, *son of peace,* is a Hebraism. In this connection it represents the notion of peace as an actual force which comes to life in the individual. The reading of the two most ancient MSS., ἐπαναπαήσεται, is regular (aor. pass. ἐπάην).—If no soul is found there fitted to receive the influence of the gospel salutation, it will not on that account be without efficacy; it will return with redoubled force, as it were, on him who uttered it.

[1] Ver. 5. The Mss. are divided between εἰσερχησθε (T. R.) and εἰσελθητε (Alex.).—Ver. 6. T. R. reads ὁ before υἱος, with ℵ. and some Mnn. only.—ℵ· B., επαναπαησεται instead of επαναπαυσεται.

Vers. 7–9.[1] "*And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.* 8 *And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you:* 9 *And heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.*"—A favourable reception is supposed. The messenger of Christ, regarding his entrance into that house above everything else as a providential event, is to fix his residence there during the entire period of his stay in that place (see on ix. 4). Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ οἰκίᾳ, not "in the same house," as if it were ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ οἰκίᾳ, but, "in that same house which he entered at first." They are, besides, to regard themselves immediately as members of the family, and to eat without scruple the bread of their hosts. It is the price of their labour. They give more than they receive.

In ver. 8 Jesus applies the same principle to the whole city which shall receive them. Their arrival resembles a triumphal entrance: they are served with food; the sick are brought to them; they speak publicly. It is a mistake to find in the words of Paul, Πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ἐσθίετε (1 Cor. x. 27), an allusion to this ver. 8; the object of the two sayings is entirely different. There is here no question whatever as to the cleanness or uncleanness of the viands; we are yet in a Jewish world.—The accus. government ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, unto (*upon*) *you*, expresses the efficacy of the message, its action upon the individuals concerned. The perf. ἤγγικε indicates that the approach of the kingdom of God is thenceforth a fact. It *is near;* the presence of the messengers of the Messiah is the proof.

Vers. 10–12.[2] "*But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say,* 11 *Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.* 12 *But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for*

[1] Ver. 7. Εστι is omitted by ℵ. B. D. L. X. Z.

[2] Ver. 10. ℵ. B. C. D. L. Z. some Mnn., εισελθητε instead of εισερχησθε.—Ver. 11. ℵ. B. D. R. some Mnn. Syr^cur. It^plerique, add εις τους ποδας after υμων.—ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. Syr^cur. It^plerique, omit εφ υμας.

Sodom than for that city." This proclamation, and the symbolical act with which it closes, are solemn events; they will play a part in the judgment of those populations.—*Καί*, this *very* dust. The dat. *ὑμῖν, to you,* expresses the idea, "*we return it to you,* by shaking it from our feet." There is the breaking up of every bond of connection (see ix. 5).—*Πλήν* indicates, as it always does, a restriction: "Further, we have nothing else to announce to you, *excepting that . . .*" In spite of the bad reception, which will undoubtedly prevent the visit of Jesus, this time will nevertheless be to them the decisive epoch.—*Ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, upon you,* in the T. R., is a gloss taken from ver. 9.—*That day* may denote the destruction of the Jewish people by the Romans, or the last judgment. The two punishments, the one of which is more national, the other individual, are blended together in this threatening of the Lord, as in that of John the Baptist (iii. 9). Yet the idea of the last judgment seems to be the prevailing one, from what follows, ver. 14.

This threatening, wherein the full gravity of the present time is revealed, and the deep feeling expressed which Jesus had of the supreme character of His mission, leads the Lord to cast a glance backward at the conduct of the cities whose probation is now concluded, and whose sentence is no longer in suspense. The memory of the awful words which they are about to hear will follow the disciples on their mission, and will impress them with its vast importance.

Vers. 13–16.[1] "*Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaïda! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.* 14 *But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment than for you.* 15 *And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell.* 16 *He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth Him that sent me.*"—The name of Chorazin is not

[1] Ver. 15. Instead of *η εως ουρανου υψωθεισα*, which the T. R. reads, with 16 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It$^{aliq.}$, the reading is *μη εως του ουρανου υψωθηση* in ℵ. B. D. L. Z. Syr^{cur}. It$^{aliq.}$—B. D. Syr^{cur}., *καταβηση* (*thou shalt descend*) instead of *καταβιβασθηση* (*thou shalt be cast down*). The Mss. are divided between *ουρανου* and *του ουρανου*, *αδου* and *του αδου*.

found either in the O. T. or in Josephus. But Jewish tradition mentions it frequently, either under the name of *Chorazaïm*, as producing a cheese of inferior quality, or under that of *Choraschin*, as situated in *Naphtali*.[1]

According to Eusebius (*Onomasticon*), Chorazin was situated 12 miles (4 leagues)—Jerome says, certainly by mistake, in his translation, 2 miles—from Capernaum. This situation corresponds exactly with the ruins which still bear the name of *Bir-Kirâzeh*, a little to the north of Tel-Hum, if we place Capernaum in the plain of Gennesaret (vol. i. p. 242).[2]—We do not know any of the numerous miracles which this declaration implies. Of those at Bethsaida we know only one. On the important consequences which this fact has for criticism, see vol. i. p. 339. The interpretation which M. Colani has attempted to give to the word δυνάμεις in this passage—works *of holiness*—will not bear discussion.

It is impossible to render well into English the image employed by Jesus. The two cities personified are represented as sitting clothed in sackcloth, and covered with ashes.—The πλήν, *excepting*, is related to an idea which is understood: "Tyre and Sidon shall also be found guilty; *only*, they shall be so in a less degree than you."—The tone rises (ver. 15) as the mind of Jesus turns to the city which had shared most richly in that effusion of grace of which Galilee has just been the subject—Capernaum. It was there that Jesus had fixed His residence; He had made it the new Jerusalem, the cradle of the kingdom of God. It is difficult to understand how commentators could have referred the words, *exalted to heaven*, to the commercial prosperity of the city, and Stier to its alleged situation on a hill by the side of the lake! This whole discourse of Jesus moves in the most elevated sphere. The point in question is the privilege which Jesus bestowed on the city by making it *His city* (Matt. ix. 1). Notwithstanding the authority of Tischendorf, we unhesitatingly prefer the received reading ἡ ὑψωθεῖσα, "*which art*

[1] *Tr. Menachoth*, fol. 85, 1; *Baba bathra*, fol. 15, 1 (see Caspari, *Chron. geogr. Einleitung in das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 76).

[2] Comp. Van de Velde and Félix Bovet. The latter says: "They assure me at Tiberias that there is on the mountain, at the distance of a league and a half from Tel-Hum, a ruin called *Bir* (*Well*) *Kéresoun*. This may probably be the Chorazin of the Gospel."—*Voyage en Terre-Sainte*, p. 415.

exalted," to that of some Alex., μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ, "*Wilt thou be exalted?* No, thou wilt come down . . ." The meaning which this reading gives is tame and insipid. It has arisen simply from the fact that the final μ of *Capernaum* was by mistake joined to the following ἡ, which, thus become a μή, necessitated the change from ὑψωθεῖσα to ὑψωθήσῃ. This variation is also found in Matthew, where the MSS. show another besides, ἢ ὑψώθης, which gives the same meaning as the T. R.—As *Heaven* is here the emblem of the highest divine favours, *Hades* is that of the deepest abasement. In the O. T. it is the place of silence, where all earthly activity ceases, where all human grandeur returns to its nothingness (Ezek. xxxi. and xxxii.).

Matthew places this declaration in the middle of the Galilean ministry, immediately after the embassy sent by John the Baptist. We can understand without difficulty the association of ideas which led the evangelist to connect the one of those pieces with the other. The impenitence of the people in respect of the forerunner was the prelude to their unbelief in respect of Jesus. But does not the historical situation indicated by Luke deserve the preference? Is such a denunciation not much more intelligible when the mission of Jesus to those cities was entirely finished? Luke adds a saying, ver. 16, which, by going back on the thought in the first part of the discourse, brings out its unity,—the position taken up with respect to the messengers of Jesus and their preaching, shall be equivalent to a position taken up with respect to Jesus, nay, with respect to God Himself. What a grandeur, then, belongs to the work which He confides to them!

2*d. The Return:* vers. 17–24.—Jesus had appointed a rendezvous for His disciples at a fixed place. From the word ὑπέστρεψαν, *they returned* (ver. 17), it would even appear that the place was that from which He had sent them. Did He await them there, or did He in the interval take some other direction along with His apostles? The sequel will perhaps throw some light on this question. His intention certainly was Himself to visit along with them all those localities in which they had preceded Him (ver. 1). This very simple explanation sets aside all the improbabilities which have been imputed to this narrative.—The return of

the disciples was signalized, first of all, by a conversation of Jesus with them about their mission (vers. 17–20); then by an outburst, unique in the life of the Saviour, regarding the unexpected but marvellous progress of His work (vers. 21–24).

Vers. 17–20.[1] *The Joy of the Disciples.*—"*And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through Thy name.* 18 *And He said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.* 19 *Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you.* 20 *Only in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice because your names are written in heaven.*" The phrase, *with joy*, expresses the tone of the whole piece. The joy of the disciples becomes afterwards that of Jesus; and then it bursts forth from His heart exalted and purified (ver. 21 et seq.). Confident in the promise of their Master, they had set themselves to heal the sick, and in this way they had soon come to attack the severest malady of all—that of possession; and they had succeeded. Their surprise at this unhoped-for success is described, with the vivacity of an entirely fresh experience, by the *καί*, "*even* the devils," and by the pres. *ὑποτάσσεται, submit themselves.*—The word *ἐθεώρουν, I was contemplating,* denotes an intuition, not a vision. Jesus does not appear to have had visions after that of His baptism. The two acts which the imperfect *I was contemplating* shows to be simultaneous, are evidently that informal perception, and the triumphs of the disciples recorded in ver. 17: "While you were expelling the subordinates, I was seeing the master fall." On the external scene, the representatives on both sides were struggling; in the inmost consciousness of Jesus, it was the two chiefs that were face to face. The fall of Satan, which He contemplates, symbolizes the complete destruction of his kingdom, the goal of that work which is inaugurated by the present successes of the

[1] Ver. 17. B. D. It$^{aliq.}$ add *δυο* after *εβδομηκοντα*.—Ver. 19. ℵ. B. C. L. X. some Mnn. Vss. and Fathers, *δεδωκα* in place of *διδωμι*, which is the reading of 15 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr. Justin, Ir.—Ver. 20. The *μαλλον* which the T. R. reads after *χαιρετε δε* is supported only by X. and some Mnn.—ℵ. B. L. X., *εγγεγραπται* instead of *εγραφη*.

disciples; comp. John xii. 31. Now the grand work of Satan on the earth, according to Scripture, is idolatry. Paganism throughout is nothing else than a diabolical enchantment. It has been not unjustly called "*une possession en grande.*"[1] Satan sets himself up as the object of human adoration. As the ambitious experience satisfaction in the incense of glory, so he finds the savour of the same in all those impure worships, which are in reality addressed to himself (1 Cor. x. 20). There remains nevertheless a great difference between the scriptural view of paganism and the opinion prevalent among the Jews, according to which *every* pagan divinity was a separate demon. *Heaven* denotes here, like ἐν ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. vi. 12, the higher sphere from the midst of which Satan acts upon human consciousness. *To fall from heaven,* is to lose this state of power. The figure used by our Lord thus represents the overthrow of idolatry throughout the whole world. The aor. πεσόντα, *falling,* denotes, under the form of a single act, all the victories of the gospel over paganism from that first preaching of the disciples down to the final *dénouement* of the great drama (Rev. xii.). The figure *lightning* admirably depicts a power of dazzling brilliance, which is suddenly extinguished. This description of the destruction of paganism, as the certain goal of the work begun by this mission of the disciples, confirms the *universalism* which we ascribed to the number 70, to the idea of harvest, ver. 2, and in general to this whole piece. Hofmann refers the word of Jesus, ver. 18, to the devil's original fall; Lange, to his defeat in the wilderness. These explanations proceed from a misunderstanding of the context.

Ver. 19. If we admit the Alex. reading δέδωκα, *I have given you,* Jesus leads His disciples to measure what they had not at first apprehended—the full extent of the power with which He has invested them; and ἰδού, *behold,* relates to the surprise which should be raised in them by this revelation. He would thus give them the key to the unhoped-for successes which they have just won. The pres. δίδωμι in the T. R. relates to the future. It denotes a new extension of powers in view of a work more considerable still than that which they have just accomplished, precisely that which Jesus has described

[1] M. A. Nicolas.

symbolically, ver. 18; and ἰδού expresses the astonishment which they might well feel at the yet more elevated perspective. Thus understood, the sentence is much more significant. *Serpents* and *scorpions* are *emblems* of the physical evils by which Satan will seek to hurt the ambassadors of Jesus. The expression, *all the power of the enemy*, embraces all the agencies of nature, of human society, of things belonging to the spiritual order, which the prince of this world can use to obstruct the work of Jesus.—Ἐπί is dependent on ἐξουσίαν rather than on πατεῖν (ix. 1). In the midst of all those diabolical instruments, the faithful servant walks clothed with invulnerable armour; not that he is not sometimes subjected to their attacks, but the wounds which he receives cannot hurt him so long as the Lord has need of his ministry (the viper at Malta, Peter's imprisonment by Herod, the messenger of Satan which buffets Paul). The same thought, with a slight difference of expression, is found Mark xvi. 18; comp. also Ps. xci. 13.

Ver. 20. Yet this victory over the forces of the enemy would be of no value to themselves, if it did not rest on their personal salvation. Think of Judas, and of those who are spoken of in Matt. vii. 22 et seq.!—Πλήν, *only*, reserves a truth more important than that which Jesus has just allowed. The word μᾶλλον, "*rather* rejoice," which the T. R. reads, and which is found in the *Sinaït.*, weakens the thought of Jesus. There is no limitation to the truth, that the most magnificent successes, the finest effects of eloquence, temples filled, conversions by thousands, are no real cause of joy to the servant of Jesus, the instrument of those works, except in so far as he is saved himself. From the personal point of view (which is that of the joy of the disciples at the moment), this ground of satisfaction is and remains the only one.—The figure of a heavenly register, in which the names of the elect are inscribed, is common in the Old Testament (Ex. xxxii. 32, 33; Isa. iv. 3; Dan. xii. 1). This book is the type of the divine decree. But a name may be blotted out of it (Ex. xxxii. 33; Jer. xvii. 13; Ps. lxix. 29; Rev. xxii. 19); a fact which preserves human freedom. Between the two readings, ἐγγέγραπται, *is inscribed*, and ἐγράφη, *was written*, it is difficult to decide.

Vers. 21–24. *The Joy of Jesus.*—We reach a point in the

life of the Saviour, the exceptional character of which is expressly indicated by the first words of the narrative, *in that same hour*. Jesus has traced to their goal the lines of which His disciples discern as yet only the beginning. He has seen in spirit the work of Satan destroyed, the structure of the kingdom of God raised on the earth. But by what hands? By the hands of those ignorant fishermen, those simple rustics whom the powerful and learned of Jerusalem call accursed rabble (John vii. 49), "the vermin of the earth" (a rabbinical expression). Perhaps Jesus had often meditated on the problem: How shall a work be able to succeed which does not obtain the assistance of any of the men of knowledge and authority in Israel? The success of the mission of the seventy has just brought Him the answer of God: it is by the meanest instruments that He is to accomplish the greatest of His works. In this arrangement, so contrary to human anticipations, Jesus recognises and adores with an overflowing heart the wisdom of His Father.

Vers. 21, 22.[1] *In that same hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I praise Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in Thy sight.* 22 *All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him.*" The πνεῦμα, *the spirit*, which is here spoken of, is undoubtedly that of Jesus Himself, as an element of His human Person (1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12; Rom. i. 9). The spirit, in this sense, is in man the boundless capacity of receiving the communications of the Divine Spirit, and consequently the seat of all those emotions which have God and the things of God for their object (see on i. 47). We think it necessary to read τῷ πνεύματι as *dat. instr.*, and that the addition of τῷ ἁγίῳ (*the holy*) and of the prep. ἐν in some MSS. arises from the false application of this expression to the Spirit

[1] Ver. 21. The Mss. are divided between ἐν τῷ πνεύματι and τῷ πνεύματι.—א. B. D. Z. Syr^{cur}. It^{aliq}. reject ὁ Ἰησοῦς after πνεύματι, and add τῷ ἁγίῳ, with 5 other Mjj. some Mnn. Syr^{sch}.—Ver. 22. 14 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It^{aliq}. here add the words, καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἰδίᾳ, which are omitted by T. R. with א. B. D. L. M. Z. π. some Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}.

of God. Ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, *to exult*, denotes an inner transport, which takes place in the same deep regions of the soul of Jesus as the opposite emotion expressed by the ἐμβριμᾶσθαι, *to groan* (John xi. 33). This powerful influence of external events on the inner being of Jesus proves how thoroughly in earnest the Gospels take His humanity. Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, strictly, *to declare, confess*, corresponds in the LXX. to הודה, *to praise*. Here it expresses a joyful and confident acquiescence in the ways of God.—The words *Father* and *Lord* indicate, the former the special love of which Jesus feels Himself to be the object in the dispensation which He celebrates, the latter the glorious sovereignty in virtue of which God dispenses with all human conditions of success, and looks for it only from His own power. The close of this verse has been explained in this way: "that *whilst Thou hast hid* . . ., Thou hast revealed . . ." The giving of thanks would thus be limited to the second fact. Comp. a similar form, Isa. l 2, Rom. vi. 17. But we doubt that this is to impair the depth of our Lord's thought. Did not God, in the way in which He was guiding the work of Jesus (in Israel), wish quite as positively the exclusion of the wise as the co-operation of the ignorant? The motive for this divine method is apparent from 1 Cor. i. 23–31, in particular from vers. 29 and 31: "*that no flesh should glory;*" and, "*that he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.*" By this rejection the great are humbled, and see that they are not needed for God's work. On the other hand, the mean cannot boast of their co-operation, since it is evident that they have derived nothing from themselves. We may compare the saying of Jesus regarding the old and the new bottles (vers. 37, 38). The wise were not to mingle the alloy of their own science with the divine wisdom of the gospel. Jesus required instruments prepared exclusively in His own school, and having no other wisdom than that which He had communicated to them from His Father (John xvii. 8). When He took a learned man for an apostle, He required, before employing him, to break him, as it were, by the experience of his folly. Jesus, in that hour of holy joy, takes account more definitely of the excellence of this divine procedure; and it is while contemplating its first effects that His heart exults and adores. "L'événement capital de l'his-

toire du monde,"[1] carried out by people who had scarcely a standing in the human race! Comp. John ix. 39.—The *ναί*, "*yea*, Father," reasserts strongly the acquiescence of Jesus in this paradoxical course. Instead of the nom. *ὁ πατήρ, Father*, it might be thought that He would have used the voc. *πάτερ*, O Father! as at the beginning of the verse. But the address does not need to be repeated. The nom. has another meaning: "It is as *a Father* that Thou art acting in thus directing my work."—The *ὅτι, for that* or *because*, which follows, is usually referred to an idea which is understood: "yea, *it is so*, because . . ." But this ellipsis would be tame. It would be better in that case to supply the notion of a prayer: "Yea, let it be and remain so, since . . . !" But is it not more simple to take *ὅτι* as depending on *ἐξομολογοῦμαι*: "yea, assuredly, and in spite of all, *I praise Thee*, because that . . ." The phrase *εὐδοκία ἔμπρ. σου* is a Hebraism (לרצון לפני יהוה, Ex. xxviii. 38). —Gess thus sums up the thought of this verse: "To pride of knowledge, blindness is the answer; to that simplicity of heart which wishes truth, revelation."

Ver. 22. The words, *And He turned Him unto His disciples*, which are read here by several Mjj., are in vain defended by Tischendorf and Meyer. They are not authentic. How indeed could we understand this *στραφείς, having turned Himself?* Turned, Meyer explains, turned from His Father, to whom He has been praying, towards men. But would the phrase *turn Himself back* be suitable in this sense? We have here a gloss occasioned by the *κατ' ἰδίαν, privately*, of ver. 23. The wish has been to establish a difference between this first revelation, made to the disciples in general (ver. 22), and the following, more special still, addressed to some of them only (ver. 23). Here we have one of the rare instances in which the T. R. (which rejects the words) differs from the third edition of Steph.

The joyful outburst of ver. 21 is carried on without interruption into ver. 22; only the first impression of adoration gives way to calm meditation. The experience through which Jesus has just passed has transported Him, as it were, into the bosom of His Father. He plunges into it, and His words become an echo of the joys of His eternal generation.

[1] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 1.

As in the passage which precedes (ver. 21), and in that which follows (22*b*), it is only *knowledge* which is spoken of, the words, "*All things are delivered to me of my Father,*" are often taken as referring to the possession and communication of religious truths, of the knowledge of God. But the work accomplished by the disciples, on occasion of which Jesus uttered those sayings, was not merely a work of teaching—there was necessarily involved in it a display of force. To overturn the throne of Satan on the earth, and to put in its place the kingdom of God, was a mission demanding a power of action. But this power was closely connected with the knowledge of God. To know God means to be initiated into His plan; means to think with Him, and consequently to will as He does. Now, to will with God, and to be self-consecrated to Him as an instrument in His service, is the secret of participation in His omnipotence. "The education of souls," Gess rightly observes, "is the greatest of the works of Omnipotence." Everything in the universe, accordingly, should be subordinate to it. There is a strong resemblance between this saying of Jesus and that of John the Baptist (John iii. 35): "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand,"—a declaration which is immediately connected with the other relative to the teaching of Jesus: "He whom God hath sent speaketh *the words of God.*"

The gift denoted by the aor. παρεδόθη, *are delivered to me,* is the subject of an eternal decree; but it is realized progressively in time, like everything which is subject to the conditions of human development. The chief periods in its realization are these three: The coming of Jesus into the world, His entrance upon His Messianic ministry, and His restoration to His divine state. Such are the steps by which the new Master took the place of the old (iv. 6), and was raised to Omnipotence. "*Delivered,*" Gess well observes, "either for salvation or for judgment." The καί, *and,* which connects the two parts of the verse, may be thus paraphrased: *and that, because* . . . The future conquest of the world by Jesus and His disciples rests on the relation which He sustains to God, and with which He identifies His people. The perfect knowledge of God is, in the end, the sceptre of the universe.—Here there is a remarkable difference in compiling

between Luke and Matthew: *οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει*, no one *recognises*, or discerns, says Matthew. To the idea of *knowing*, this *επι* (to put the finger *upon*) has the effect of adding the idea of confirming experimentally. The knowledge in question is one *de visu*. Luke uses the simple verb *γινώσκειν*, *to know*, which is weaker and less precise; but he makes up for this deficiency in the notion of the verb by amplifying its regimen, "*What is* the Father . . ., *what is* the Son;" that is to say, *all that God is* as a Father to the man who has the happiness of knowing Him as a son, and *all that the name son* includes for the man who has the happiness of hearing it pronounced by the mouth of the Father,—all that the Father and Son *are the one to the other*. Perhaps Matthew's form of expression is a shade more intellectual or didactic; that of Luke rather moves in the sphere of feeling. How should we explain the two forms, each of which is evidently independent of the other? Jesus must have employed in Aramaic the verb ידע, *to know*.[1] Now ידע is construed either with the accusative or with one of the two prepositions ב, *in*, or על, *upon*. The construction with one or other of these prepositions adds something to the notion of the verb. For example, שׁמע, *to hear*; שׁמע ל, *to listen*; שׁמע ב, to listen *with acquiescence of heart*. There is a similar difference of meaning between ידע and ידע ב or ידע על,—a difference analogous to that between the two expressions, *rem cognoscere* and *cognoscere de re*, to know *a thing* and to know *of a thing*. Thus, in the passage in Job xxxvii. 16, where ידע is construed with על, *upon*, the sense is not, "*Knowest thou* balancings of the clouds?"—Job could not but have *known* the fact which falls under our eyes,—but "*understandest thou* the . . .?" Now if we suppose that Jesus used the verb ידע with one of the prepositions ב or ל, the two Greek forms may be explained as two different attempts to render the entire fulness of the Aramaic expression; that of Matthew strengthening the notion of the simple verb by the preposition *ἐπί* (*re*cognise) (which would correspond more literally with ידע על); that of Luke, by giving greater fulness to the idea of the object, by means of the paraphrase *τίς ἐστιν*, *what is*.[2]

[1] I owe the following observations to the kindness of M. Felix Bovet.

[2] In the passage quoted from Job, the two principal German translations present a remarkable parallel. De Wette: *Weisst du um . . .*? Ewald: *Verstehst*

A remarkable example, ix. 3, has already shown how differences of matter and form in the reproduction of the words of Jesus by our evangelists are sometimes explained with the utmost ease by going back to the Hebrew or Aramaic text.[1] What a proof of the authenticity of those discourses! What a proof also of the independence of our several Greek Digests!

That exclusive knowledge which the Father and Son have of one another is evidently not *the cause* of their paternal and filial relation; on the contrary, it is *the effect* of it. Jesus is not the *Son* because He alone perfectly knows the Father, and is fully known only by Him; but He knows Him and is known by Him in this way only because He is *the Son*. In like manner, God is not *the Father* because He alone knows the Son, and is known only by Him; but this double knowledge is the effect of that paternal relation which He sustains to the Son.—The article before the two substantives serves to raise this unique relation above the relative temporal order of things, and to put it in the sphere of the absolute, in the very essence of the two Beings. God did not become Father at an hour marked on some earthly dial. If He is a Father to certain beings born in time, it is because He is *the Father* absolutely,—that is to say, in relation to a Being who is not born in time, and who is toward Him the Son as absolutely. Such is the explanation of the difficult verse, Eph. iii. 15. Mark, who has not the passage, gives another wherein the term *the Son* is used in the same absolute sense, xiii. 32: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father." After words like these, we cannot admit any radical difference between the Jesus of the Synoptics and that of John.[2] The

du . . . ? Both have thoroughly apprehended the sense of the original expression; each has sought to reproduce it in his own way.

[1] Many other similar examples might be cited, *e.g.* Luke vi. 20. If Jesus said עניים, we can explain both the brief πτωχοί of Luke as a literal translation *ad sensum* (according to the known shade which the meaning of עני bears throughout the Old Testament).

[2] M. Réville has found out a way of getting rid of our passage. Jesus, he will have it, said one day in a melancholy tone: "God alone reads my heart to its depths, and I alone also know God." And this "perfectly natural" thought, "under the influence of a later theology," took the form in which we find it here (*Hist. du Dogme de la Div. de J. C.* p. 17). M. Réville finds a confirma-

existence of the Son belonging to the essence of the Father, the pre-existence of the one is implied in the eternity of the other.

Immediate knowledge of the Father is the exclusive privilege of the Son. But it becomes the portion of believers as soon as He initiates them into the contents of His filial consciousness, and consents to share it with them. By this participation in the consciousness of the Son (the work of the Holy Spirit), the believer in his turn attains to the intuitive knowledge of the Father. Comp. John i. 18, xiv. 6, xvii. 26. With Gess, we ought to remark the importance of the priority given to the knowledge of the Son by the Father over that of the Father by the Son. Were the order inverted, the gift of all things, the παραδίδοναι, would have appeared to rest on the religious instruction which Jesus had been giving to men. The actual order makes it the consequence of the unsearchable relation between Jesus and the Father, in virtue of which He can be to souls everything that the Father Himself is to them.—This passage (vers. 21, 22) is placed by Matthew, chap. xi., after the denunciation pronounced on the Galilean cities, and immediately following on the deputation of John the Baptist. We cannot comprehend those of our critics, Gess included, who prefer this situation to that of Luke. Gess thinks that the disciples (x. 21) are contrasted with the unbelieving Galilean cities. But the whole passage refers to the disciples as *instruments* in God's work; and Jesus contrasts them not with the ignorant Galileans, but with the *wise*

tion of his hypothesis in the fact that in their present form the words strangely break the thread of the discourse. We think that we have shown their relation to the situation in general, and to the preceding context in particular. And the searching study of the relations between Luke's form and that of Matthew has led us up to a Hebrew formula necessarily anterior to all "later theology." One must have an exegetical conscience of rare elasticity to be able to find rest by means of such expedients.—M. Renan having no hope of *evacuating* the words of their real contents, simply sets them down as a later interpolation: "Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22 represent in the synoptic system a late interpolation in keeping with the type of the Johannine discourses." But what! an interpolation simultaneously in the two writings? in two different contexts? in all the manuscripts and in all the versions? and with the differences which we have established and explained by the Aramaic? Let us take an example: The doxology interpolated in Matthew (vi. 13), at the end of the Lord's prayer. It is wanting in very many Mss. and Vss., and is not found in the parallel passage in Luke. Such are the evidences of a real interpolation.

of Jerusalem. See Matthew even, ver. 25. As to the following sentence, ver. 22, Gess thinks that he can paraphrase it thus: "No man, *not even John the Baptist,* knoweth the Son . . .," in order thus to connect it with the account of the forerunner's embassy, which forms the preceding context in Matthew. But in relation to the preceding verse the word *no man* alludes not to John, but to the *wise* and learned of Jerusalem, who pretended that they alone had the knowledge of God (xi. 52). It is not difficult, then, to perceive the superiority of Luke's context; and we may prove here, as everywhere else, the process of concatenation, in virtue of which we find different elements united together in Matt. xi. 7–30 by a simple association of ideas in the mind of the compiler.

With the last words of ver. 22, *and he to whom the Son will reveal Him,* the thought of Jesus reverts to His disciples who surround Him, and in whom there is produced at this very time the beginning of the promised illumination. He now addresses Himself *to them.* The meditation of ver. 22 is the transition between the adoration of ver. 21 and the congratulation which follows.

Vers. 23 and 24.[1] "*And He turned Him unto His disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see:* 24 *For I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.*" Elevated as was the conception which the disciples had of the person and work of Jesus, they were far from appreciating at its full value the fact of His appearance, and the privilege of being the agents of such a Master. At this solemn hour Jesus seeks to open their eyes. But He cannot express Himself publicly on the subject. It is, as it were, in an undertone that He makes this revelation to them, vers. 23 and 24. This last sentence admirably finishes the piece. We find it in Matthew, chap. xiii., applied to the new mode of teaching which Jesus had just employed by making use of the form of parables. The expression, *those things which ye see,* is incompatible with this application, which is thus swept away by the text of Matthew himself.—Luke here omits the

[1] Ver. 23. D. Syr$^{cur.}$, It^{plerique}, Vg. omit κατ' ἰδίαν.

beautiful passage with which Matthew (xi. 28–30) closes this discourse: "*Come unto me . . .*" If he had known such words, would he have omitted them? Is not this invitation in the most perfect harmony with the spirit of his Gospel? Holtzmann, who feels how much the theory of the employment of a common source is compromised by this omission, endeavours to explain it. He supposes that Luke, as a good Paulinist, must have taken offence at the word ταπεινός, *humble*, when applied to Christ, as well as at the terms *yoke* and *burden*, which recalled the Law too strongly. And it is in face of Luke xxii. 27, "I am among you *as he that serveth* . . .," and of xvi. 17, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail . . .," that such reasons are advanced! His extremity here drives Holtzmann to use one of those Tübingen processes which he himself combats throughout his whole book.

Modern criticism denies the historical character of this second mission. It is nothing more, Baur alleges, than an invention of Luke to lower the mission of the Twelve, and to exalt that of Paul and his assistants, of whom our seventy are provided as the precursors. With what satisfaction does not this Luke, who is silent as to the effects of the sending of the Twelve, describe those of the present mission! He goes the length of applying to the latter, and that designedly, part of the instructions which Jesus had given (Matt. x.) in regard to the former! Besides, the other Gospels nowhere mention those seventy evangelists whose mission Luke is pleased to relate! Holtzmann, who likewise denies the historical character of the narrative, does not, however, ascribe to Luke any deliberate fraud. The explanation of the matter is, according to him, a purely literary one. Of the two sources which Matthew and Luke consulted, the former—that is, the original Mark—recorded the sending of the Twelve with a few brief instructions, such as we have found in Luke ix. 1–6 and Mark vi. 7–13; the second, the *Logia*, contained the full and detailed discourse which Jesus must have delivered on the occasion, as we read it Matt. x. The author of our first Gospel saw that the discourse of the *Logia* applied to the sending of the Twelve mentioned in the original Mark, and attached it thereto. Luke had not the same perspicacity. After having related the mission of the Twelve (ix. 1–6) after the proto-Mark, he found the great discourse in the *Logia;* and to get a suitable place for it, he thought that he must create a situation at his own hand. With this view, but without the least purpose of a dogmatic kind, he imagined a second mission, that of the seventy.

But if the origin of this narrative were as Baur supposes, how

should only the Twelve reappear later in the Gospel of Luke (xvii. 5, xviii. 31), without ever a word more of those seventy? How should Luke in the Acts make no mention of those latter? Was it not easy and natural, after having *invented* them, to give them a part to play in the mission organized under Paul's direction? An author does not lie in good earnest, only to forget thereafter to make use of his fraud. We have found that, as to the mission of the Twelve, Luke says at least (ix. 10), "And the apostles, when they were returned, told Him all that they had done" (remark the ὅσα, stronger than the simple ἃ); while Matthew, after the discourse, adds not a single word about the mission and its results! In short, the narrative of the sending of the seventy is so far from being a Paulinist invention, that in a work of the second century, proceeding from the sect most hostile to Paul, we find the following passage put in the mouth of Peter (*Recognit. Clem.* i. 24): "He first chose us twelve, whom He called apostles; then He chose seventy-two other disciples from among the most faithful." The old historians have undoubtedly been somewhat arbitrary in numbering among those seventy many persons whom they designate as having formed part of them. But this false application proves nothing against the fact itself; on the contrary, it attests the impression which the Church had of its reality.

The opinion of Holtzmann would charge the sacred historian with an arbitrariness incompatible with the serious love of historical truth which is expressed, according to Holtzmann himself, in his introduction. Besides, we shall see (xvii. 1–10) how entirely foreign such procedure was to the mind of Luke. When, finally, we consider the internal perfection of his whole narrative, the admirable correspondence between the emotions of our Lord and the historical event which gives rise to them, have we not a sufficient guarantee for the reality of this episode? As the account of the healing of the lunatic child is the masterpiece of Mark, this description of the sending of the seventy disciples is the pearl of Luke.

4. *The Conversation with the Scribe, and the Parable of the Samaritan:* x. 25–37.—Jesus slowly continues His journey, stopping at each locality. The most varied scenes follow one another without internal relation, and as circumstances bring them. Weizsäcker, starting from the assumption that this framework is not historical, has set himself to seek a systematic plan, and affects to find throughout an order according to subjects. Thus he would have the parable of the good Samaritan connected with the sending of the seventy by its object, which was originally to prove the *right of the evangelists,* to whatever nationality they might belong. But where in the parable is there to be found the least trace of correspondence between the work done by the good Samaritan, and the

function of the evangelists in the apostolic church? How could the original tendency fail to come out at some point of the description? Holtzmann thinks that in what follows Luke conjoins two distinct accounts—that of the scribe (vers. 25–28), which we find in Mark xii. 28 and Matt. xxii. 35, and the parable of the good Samaritan taken from the *Logia*. The connection which our Gospel establishes between the two events (ver. 29) is nothing else than a rather unskilful combination on the part of Luke. But there is no proof that the scribe of Luke is the same as that spoken of by Mark and Matthew. It is at Jerusalem, and in the days which precede the passion, that this latter appears; and above all, as Meyer acknowledges, the matter of discussion is entirely different. The scribe of Jerusalem asks Jesus which is the greatest commandment. His is a theological question. That of Galilee, like the rich young man, desires Jesus to point out to him the means of salvation. His is a practical question. Was there but one Rabbin in Israel who could enter into discussion with Jesus on such subjects? It is possible, no doubt, that some external details belonging to one of those scenes got mixed up in tradition with the narrative of the other. But the moral contents form the essential matter, and they are too diverse to admit of being identified. As to the connection which ver. 29 establishes between the interview and the parable which follows, it is confirmed by the lesson which flows from the parable (vers. 36, 37), and about the authenticity of which there is no doubt.

Vers. 25–28.[1] *The Work which saves.*—In Greece the object of search is truth; in Israel it is salvation. So this same question is found again in the mouth of the rich young man. —The expression *stood up* shows that Jesus and the persons who surrounded Him were seated. Several critics think this "scenery" (Holtzmann) inconsistent with the idea of a journey, as if we had not to do here with a course of preaching, and as if Jesus must have been, during the weeks this journey lasts, constantly on His feet!—The *test* to which the scribe wished to subject Jesus bore either on His orthodoxy or on His theological ability. His question rests on the idea of the

[1] Ver. 27. ℵ. B. D. Δ. Z. some Mnn. It[alliq.] read, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ, instead of ἐξ with the genitive.

merit of works. Strictly, *on having done what work shall I certainly inherit . . .?* In the term *to inherit* there is an allusion to the possession of the land of Canaan, which the children of Israel had received as a heritage from the hand of God, and which to the Jewish mind continued to be the type of the Messianic blessedness. The question of Jesus distinguishes between the contents (τί) and the text (πῶς) of the law. It has been thought that, while saying, *How readest thou?* Jesus pointed to the phylactery attached to the scribe's dress, and on which passages of the law were written. But at ver. 28 we should find *thou hast well read,* instead of *thou hast answered right.* And it cannot be proved that those two passages were united on the phylacteries. The first alone appears to have figured on them.

It is not wonderful that the scribe instantly quotes the first part of the summary of the law, taken from Deut. vi. 5; for the Jews were required to repeat this sentence morning and evening. As to the second, taken from Lev. xix. 18, we may doubt whether he had the readiness of mind to join it immediately with the first, and so to compose this magnificent *resumé* of the substance of the law. In Mark xii. and Matt. xxii. it is Jesus Himself who unites those two utterances. It is probable, as Bleek thinks, that Jesus guided the scribe by a few questions to formulate this answer. Ver. 26 has all the appearance of the opening of a catechetical course.—The first part of the summary includes four terms; in Hebrew there are only three—לב, *heart;* נפש, *soul;* מאוד, *might.* The LXX. also have only three, but they translate לב, *heart,* by διανοία, *mind;* and this is the word which appears in Luke as the fourth term. In Matthew there are three: διανοία is the last; in Mark, four: σύνεσις takes the place of διανοία, and is put second. Καρδία, *the heart,* in Mark and Luke is foremost; it is the most general term: it denotes in Scripture the central *focus* from which all the rays of the moral life go forth; and that in their three principal directions—the powers of feeling, or the affections, נפש, *the soul,* in the sense of feeling; the active powers, the impulsive aspirations, מאוד, the *might,* the will; and the intellectual powers, analytical or contemplative, διανοία, *mind.* The difference between the heart, which resembles the trunk, and the three branches,

feeling, will, and understanding, is emphatically marked, in the Alex. variation, by the substitution of the preposition ἐν, *in*, for ἐκ, *with* (from), in the three last members. Moral life proceeds *from* the heart, and manifests itself without, *in* the three forms of activity indicated. The impulse Godward proceeds *from* the heart, and is realized in the life *through* the affection, which feeds on that supreme object; *through* the will, which consecrates itself actively to the accomplishment of His will; and *through* the mind, which pursues the track of His thoughts, in all His works.—The second part of the summary is the corollary of the first, and cannot be realized except in connection with it. Nothing but the reigning love of God can so divest the individual of devotion to his own person, that the ego of his neighbour shall rank in his eyes exactly on the same level as his own. The pattern must be loved above all, if the image in others is to appear to us as worthy of esteem and love as in ourselves.—Thus to love is, as Jesus says, the path to life, or rather it is life itself. God has no higher life than that of love. The answer of Jesus is therefore not a simple accommodation to the legal point of view. The work which saves, or salvation, is really loving. The gospel does not differ from the law in its aim; it is distinguished from it only by its indication of means and the communication of strength.

Vers. 29–37. *The good Samaritan.*—How is such love to be attained? This would have been the question put by the scribe, had he been in the state of soul which Paul describes Rom. vii., and which is the normal preparation for faith. He would have confessed his impotence, and repeated the question in a yet deeper sense than at the beginning of the interview: What shall I do? What shall I do in order to love thus?—But instead of that, feeling himself condemned by the holiness of the law which he has himself formally expressed, he takes advantage of his ignorance, in other words, of the obscurity of the letter of the law, to excuse himself for not having observed it: "What does the word neighbour mean? How far does its application reach?" So long as one does not know exactly what this expression signifies, it is quite impossible, he means, to fulfil the commandment. Thus the remark of Luke, "willing *to justify* himself," finds an explanation which is perfectly natural.—The real aim of the

parable of the good Samaritan is to show the scribe that the answer to the theological question, which he thinks good to propose, is written by nature on every right heart, and that to know, nothing is needed but the *will* to understand it. But Jesus does not at all mean thereby that it is by his charitable disposition, or by this solitary act of kindness, that the Samaritan can obtain salvation. We must not forget that a totally new question, that of the *meaning* of the word neighbour, has intervened. It is to the latter question that Jesus replies by the parable. He lets the scribe understand that this question, proposed by him as so difficult, is resolved by a right heart, without its ever proposing it at all. This ignorant Samaritan naturally (*φύσει*, Rom. ii. 14) possessed the light which the Rabbins had not found, or had lost, in their theological lucubrations. Thus was condemned the excuse which he had dared to advance.—May we not suppose it is from sayings such as this that Paul has derived his teaching regarding the *law written in the heart*, and regarding its partial observance by the Gentiles, Rom. ii. 14–16?

Vers. 29–32.[1] *The Priest and the Levite.*—Lightfoot has proved that the Rabbins did not, in general, regard as their neighbours those who were not members of the Jewish nation. Perhaps the subject afforded matter for learned debates in their schools. The word *πλήσιον*, being without article here, might be taken in strictness as an adverb. It is simpler to regard it as the well-known substantive *ὁ πλήσιον*. The *καί, and*, introducing the answer, brings it into relation with the preceding question which called it forth. The word *ὑπολαβών, rejoining*, which does not occur again in the N. T., is put for the ordinary term *ἀποκριθείς, answering*, to give more gravity to what follows. The mountainous, and for the most part desert country, traversed by the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, was far from safe. Jerome (*ad Jerem.* iii. 2) relates that in his time it was infested by hordes of Arabs. The distance between the two cities is seven leagues. The *καί, also*, before *ἐκδύσαντες*, ver. 30, supposes a first act which is self-

[1] Ver. 29. The Mss. are divided between *δικαιουν* (T. R.) and *δικαιωσαι* (Alex.). —Ver. 30. E. G. H. T. V. Δ. Λ. several Mnn. It^{aliq}. Vg., *ἐξιδυσαν* instead of *ἐκδυσαντες*.—ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. omit *τυγχανοντα*.—Ver. 32. ℵ^{c}. B. L. X. Z. omit *γενομενος*.—ℵ. D. Γ. Δ. several Mnn. Vss. read *αυτον* after *ιδων*.

understood, the relieving him of his purse.—There is a sort of irony in the *κατὰ συγκυρίαν, by chance.* It is certainly not by accident that the narrator brings those two personages on the scene.—The preposition *ἀντί* in *ἀντιπαρῆλθε, he passed by,* might denote a curve made in an opposite direction; but it is simpler to understand it in the sense of *over against.* In view of such a spectacle, they pass on. Comp. the antithesis *προσελθών, having gone to him,* ver. 34.

Vers. 33–35.[1] *The Samaritan.*—For the sake of contrast, Jesus chooses a Samaritan, a member of that half Gentile people who were separated from the Jews by an old national hatred. In the matter about which priests are ignorant, about which the scribe is still disputing, this simple and right heart sees clearly at the first glance. His neighbour is the human being, whoever he may be, with whom God brings him into contact, and who has need of his help. The term *ὁδεύων, as he journeyed,* conveys the idea that he might easily have thought himself excused from the duty of compassion toward this stranger.—In every detail of the picture, ver. 34, there breathes the most tender pity (*ἐσπλαγχνίσθη*).—Oil and wine always formed part of the provision for a journey.—We see from what follows that *πανδοχεῖον* signifies not a simple caravansary, but a real inn, where people were received for payment. *Ἐπί,* ver. 35, should be understood as in Acts iii. 1: *Toward* the morrow, that is to say, at daybreak. The term *ἐξελθών, when he departed,* shows that he was now on horseback, ready to go. Two pence are equal to about 1s. 4d.—After having brought the wounded man the length of the hostelry, he might have regarded himself as discharged from all responsibility in regard to him, and given him over to the care of his own countrymen, saying: "He is your neighbour rather than mine." But the compassion which constrained him to begin, obliges him to finish.—What a masterpiece is this portrait! What a painter was its author, and what a narrator was he who has thus transmitted it to us, undoubtedly in all its original freshness!

[1] Ver. 33. ℵ. B. L. Z. 3 Mnn. omit *αὐτόν* after *ἰδών.*—Ver. 35. ℵ. B. D. L. X. Z. some Mnn. Syr. It. omit *ἐξελθών.*—B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ omit *αὐτῷ* after *ἔφτιν.*

Vers. 36, 37.[1] *The Moral.*—The question with which Jesus obliges the scribe to make application of the parable may seem badly put. According to the theme of discussion: "Who is my neighbour?" (ver. 29), it would seem that He should have asked: Whom, then, wilt thou regard as thy neighbour to guide thee to him, as the Samaritan was guided to thy compatriot? But as the term neighbour implies the idea of reciprocity, Jesus has the right of reversing the expressions, and He does so not without reason. Is it not more effective to ask: By whom should I like to be succoured in distress? than: Whom should I assist in case of distress? To the first question, the reply is not doubtful. Self-regard coming to the aid of conscience, all will answer: By everybody. The scribe is quite alive to this. He cannot escape, when he is brought face to face with the question in this form. Only, as his heart refuses to pronounce the word Samaritan with praise, he paraphrases the odious name. On the use of μετά, ver. 37, see on i. 58.—In this final declaration, Jesus contrasts the *doing* of the Samaritan with the vain casuistry of the Rabbins. But while saying, *Do thou likewise*, He does not at all add, as at ver. 28, *and thou shalt live.* For beneficence does not give life or salvation. Were it even the complete fulfilment of the second part of the sum of the law, we may not forget the first part, the realization of which, though not less essential to salvation, may remain a strange thing to the man of greatest beneficence. But what is certain is, that the man who in his conduct contradicts the law of nature, is on the way opposed to that which leads to faith and salvation (John iii. 19–21).

The Fathers have dwelt with pleasure on the allegorical interpretation of this parable: The wounded man representing humanity; the brigands, the devil; the priest and Levite, the law and the prophets. The Samaritan is Jesus Himself; the oil and wine, divine grace; the ass, the body of Christ; the inn, the Church; Jerusalem, paradise; the expected return of the Samaritan, the final advent of Christ. This exegesis rivalled that of the Gnostics.

5. *Martha and Mary:* x. 38–42.—Here is one of the

[1] Ver. 36. ℵ. B. L. Z. some Mnn. Vss. omit οὖν after τίς.—Ver. 37. The Mss. vary between οὖν (T. R.) and δέ (Alex.) after εἶπε.

most exquisite scenes which Gospel tradition has preserved to us; it has been transmitted by Luke alone. What surprises us in the narrative is, the place which it occupies in the middle of a journey through Galilee. On the one hand, the expression ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτούς, *as they went*, indicates that we have a continuation of the same journey as began at ix. 51; on the other, the knowledge which we have of Martha and Mary, John xi., does not admit of a doubt that the event transpired in Judea at Bethany, near Jerusalem. Hengstenberg supposes that Lazarus and his two sisters dwelt first in Galilee, and afterwards came to settle in Judea. But the interval between autumn and the following spring is too short to allow of such a change of residence. In John xi. 1, Bethany is called *the town of Mary and her sister Martha*, a phrase which assumes that they had lived there for a length of time. The explanation is therefore a forced one. There is another more natural. In John x. there is indicated a short visit of Jesus to Judea in the month of December of that year, at the feast of dedication. Was not that then the time when the visit took place which is here recorded by Luke? Jesus must have interrupted His evangelistic journey to go to Jerusalem, perhaps while the seventy disciples were carrying out their preparatory mission. After that short appearance in the capital, He returned to put Himself at the head of the caravan, to visit the places where the disciples had announced His coming. Luke himself certainly did not know the place where this scene transpired (*in a certain village*); he transmits the fact to us as he found it in his sources, or as he had received it by oral tradition, without more exact local indication. Importance had been attached rather to the moral teaching than to the external circumstances. It is remarkable that the scene of the preceding parable is precisely the country between Jericho and Jerusalem. Have we here a second proof of a journey to Judea at that period?

Here we must recall two things: 1. That the oral tradition from which our written compilations (with the exception of that of John) are derived, was formed immediately after the ministry of our Lord, when the actors in the Gospel drama were yet alive, and that it was obliged to exercise great discretion in regard to the persons who figured in it, especially

where women were concerned; hence the omission of many proper names. 2. That it is John's Gospel which has restored those names to the Gospel history; but that at the time when Luke wrote, this sort of *incognito* still continued.

Vers. 38–40.[1] *Martha's Complaint.*—It is probably the indefinite expression of Luke, *into a certain village,* which John means to define by the words: *Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha,* xi. 1; as also the words of Luke v. 39, *which sat at Jesus' feet,* seem to be alluded to in those others: *But Mary sat still in the house,* xi. 20. The entire conduct of Martha and Mary, John xi., reproduces in every particular the characters of the two sisters as they appear from Luke x.—It has been supposed that Martha was the wife of Simon the Leper (Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark xiv. 3), and that her brother and sister had become inmates of the house. All this is pure hypothesis.—If the two words ἥ and καί, "*which also sat,*" really belong to the text, Luke gives us to understand that Mary began by serving as well as Martha; but that, having completed her task, she *also* sat to listen, rightly considering that, with such a guest, the essential thing was not serving, but above all being herself served.—Jesus was seated with His feet stretched behind Him (vii. 38).—It was therefore at His feet behind Him that she took her place, not to lose any of His words. The term περιεσπᾶτο (*was cumbered*), ver. 40, denotes a distraction at once external and moral. The word ἐπιστᾶσα, *came to Him,* especially with δέ adversative, *but,* indicates a sudden suspension of her feverish activity; at the sight of Jesus and her sister, who was listening to Him with gladness, Martha stops short, takes up a bold attitude, and addresses the latter, reproaching her for her selfishness, and Jesus for His partiality, implied in the words, *Dost Thou not care?* Nevertheless, by the very word which she uses, κατέλιπε, *hath left me* (this reading is preferable to the imperfect κατέλειπε), she acknowledges that Mary up till then had taken part in serving. In the compound συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι three ideas

[1] Ver. 38. ℵ. B. L. Z. Syr$^{cur.}$, εν δε τω πορευεσθαι instead of εγενετο δε εν τω πορευεσθαι.—ℵ. C. L. Z., οικιαν instead of οικον.—ℵ*. L. Z. omit αυτης.—B. omits τις . . . αυτης.—Ver. 39. ℵ. L*. Z. omit η.—D. It$^{alliq.}$ omit και after η.—Instead of παρακαθισασα (T. R.), ℵ. A. B. C. L. Z., παρακαθεσθεισα.—Instead of παρα, the same, προς.—Instead of Ιησου, the same, κυριου.—Ver. 40. Instead of κατιλιπειν, 15 Mjj. καταλειπειν.—D. L. Z., ειπον instead of ειπε.

are included,—charging oneself with a burden (the middle) for another (*ἀντί*), and sharing it with him (*σύν*).

Vers. 41, 42.[1] *The Answer.*—Jesus replies to the reproach of Martha by charging her with exaggeration in the activity which she is putting forth. If she has so much trouble, it is because she wishes it. *Μεριμνᾶν, to be careful,* refers to moral preoccupation; *τυρβάζεσθαι, to be troubled,* to external agitation. The repetition of Martha's name in the answer of Jesus is intended to bring her back gently, but firmly, from her dissipation of mind. The expression in which Jesus justifies His rebuke is at once serious and playful. According to the received reading, *One thing only is needful,* the thought might be: "A single dish is sufficient." But as it was certainly not a lesson on simplicity of food that Jesus wished to give here, we must in that case admit a double reference, like that which is so often found in the words of Jesus (John iv. 31–34): "A single kind of nourishment is sufficient for the body, as one only is necessary for the soul." This is probably the meaning of the Alex. reading: "*There needs but little* (for the body), *or even but one thing* (for the soul)." There is subtilty in this reading; too much perhaps. It has against it 15 Mjj., the Peschito, and a large number of the copies of the Itala. It is simpler to hold that, by the expression *one thing,* Jesus meant to designate spiritual nourishment, the divine word, but not without an allusion to the simplicity in physical life which naturally results from the preponderance given to a higher interest. The expression *ἀγαθὴ μερίς, that good part,* alludes to the portion of honour at a feast. The pronoun *ἥτις, which as such,* brings out the relation between the excellence of this portion, and the impossibility of its being lost to him who has chosen it, and who perseveres in his choice. In this defence of Mary's conduct there is included an invitation to Martha to imitate her at once.

The two sisters have often been regarded as representing two equally legitimate aspects of the Christian life, inward devotion and practical activity. But Martha does not in the least represent external activity, such as Jesus approves. Her

[1] Ver. 41. ℵ. B. L. It[alliq.] Vg., *ο κυριος* instead of *ο Ιησους.*—ℵ. B. C. D. L., *θορυβαζη* instead of *τυρβαζη.*—Ver. 42. ℵ. B. L. 2 Mnn., *ολιγων δε εστι χρεια η ενος* instead of *ενος δε εστι χρεια.*

very distraction proves that the motive of her work is not pure, and that her self-importance as hostess has a larger share in it than it ought. On the other hand, Mary as little represents a morbid quietism, requiring to be implemented by the work of an active life. Mary served as long as it appeared to her needful to do so. Thereafter she understood also that, when we have the singular privilege of welcoming a Jesus under our roof, it is infinitely more important to seek to receive than to give. Besides, some months later (John xii. 3 et seq.), Mary clearly showed that when action or giving was required, she was second to none.

The Tübingen school has discovered depths in this narrative unknown till it appeared. In the person of Martha, Luke seeks to stigmatize Judaizing Christianity, that of legal works; in the person of Mary he has exalted the Christianity of Paul, that of justification without works and by faith alone. What extraordinary prejudice must prevail in a mind which can to such a degree mistake the exquisite simplicity of this story!—Supposing that it really had such an origin, would not this dogmatic importation have infallibly discoloured both the matter and form of the narrative? A time will come when those judgments of modern criticism will appear like the wanderings of a diseased imagination.

6. *Prayer:* xi. 1–13.—Continuing still to advance leisurely, the Lord remained faithful to His habit of prayer. He was not satisfied with that constant direction of soul toward His Father, to which the meaning of the command, *Pray without ceasing*, is often reduced. There were in His life special times and positive acts of prayer. This is proved by the following words: *When He ceased praying.* It was after one of those times, which no doubt had always something solemn in them for those who surrounded Him, that one of His disciples, profiting by the circumstance, asked Him to give a more special directory on the subject of prayer. Holtzmann is just enough to protest against this preface, ver. 1, being involved in the wholesale rejection which modern criticism visits on those short introductions of Luke. He finds a proof of its authenticity in the detail so precisely stated: "*Teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.*" It is, according to him, one of the cases in which the historical situation was expressly stated in the *Logia.*—The Lord's Prayer, as well as the instructions about prayer which follow, are placed by

Matthew in the course of the Sermon on the Mount (chap. vi. and vii.). Gess thinks that this model of prayer may have been twice given forth. Why might not a disciple, some months after the Sermon on the Mount, have put to Jesus the request which led Him to repeat it? And as to the context in Matthew, Luke xx. 47 proves that much speaking belonged as much to the prayers of the Pharisees as to those of the heathen. That is true; but the *prolixity* to which the Lord's prayer is opposed in the Sermon on the Mount, and by means of which the worshipper hopes to obtain a hearing, has nothing to do with that *ostentation before men* which Jesus stigmatizes in Matt. vi. as characterizing the righteousness of the Pharisees. And the repetition of this model of prayer, though not impossible, is far from probable. What we have here, therefore, is one of those numerous elements, historically alien to the context of the Sermon on the Mount, which are found collected in this exposition of the *new righteousness*. The reflections regarding prayer, Matt. vii., belong to a context so broken, that if the connections alleged by commentators show to a demonstration what association of ideas the compiler has followed in placing them here, they cannot prove that Jesus could ever have taught in such a manner. In Luke, on the contrary, the connection between the different parts of this discourse is as simple as the occasion is natural. Here, again, we find the two evangelists such as we have come to know them: Matthew teaches, Luke relates.

This account embraces: 1*st*. The model of Christian prayer (vers. 1-4); 2*d*. An encouragement to pray thus, founded on the certainty of being heard (vers. 5-13).

1*st*. Vers. 1-4.[1] *The Model of Prayer.*—"*And it came to*

[1] Ver. 1. ℵ[a]. Δ. some Mnn. Syr[cur]. It[plerique] omit *και* before Ιωαννης.—Ver. 2. The words *ημων εν τοις ουρανοις* are omitted by ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. Tert.; they are found in T. R., according to 18 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr. It.—Ver. 3. Instead of *ελθετω η βασιλεια σου*, Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus Confessor seem to have read, *ελθετω αγιον πνευμα σου εφ' ημας και καθαρισατω ημας*; others to have added to the end of the petition an explanation like this: *τουτ' εστι το πνευμα αγιον*.—B. L. some Mnn. Syr[cur]. It[aliq]. Vg. Tert. Aug. omit the words *γενηθητω . . . γης*, which are read by the T. R. with 19 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr[sch]. It[plerique]; Tert. (*de Oratione*) places them between the first and second petitions. —Ver. 3. Instead of *ημων* Marcion appears to have read *σου*.—Ver. 4. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. Vg. Orig. Cyril. Tert. Aug. omit the words *αλλα . . . πονηρου*, which are found in the T. R. with 17 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr. It[plerique].

pass, that as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. 2 *And He said unto them, When ye pray, say, Father, hallowed be thy name; Thy kingdom come;* 3 *Give us day by day our needful bread;* 4 *And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us; and lead us not into temptation.*". It was the custom among the Jews to pray regularly three times a day. John had kept up the practice, as well as that of fasting (ver. 33); and it was doubtless with a view to this daily exercise that he had given a form to his disciples.—In the words, *when ye pray, say,* the term προσεύχεσθαι, *to pray,* denotes the state of adoration, and the word *say,* the prayer formally expressed. —It is evident that this order, *when ye pray, say,* does not mean that the formula was to be slavishly repeated on every occasion of prayer; it was the type which was to give its impression to every Christian prayer, but in a free, varied, and spontaneous manner. The distinctive characteristic of this formulary is *the filial spirit,* which appears from the first in the invocation, *Father;* then in the object and order of the petitions. Of the five petitions which the Lord's Prayer includes in Luke, two bear directly on the cause of God—they stand at the head; three to the wants of man—they occupy the second place. This absolute priority given to divine interests implies an emptying of ourselves, a heavenly love and zeal which are not natural to man, and which suppose in us the heart of a true child of God, occupied above all things with the interests of his heavenly Father. After having thus forgotten himself, and become lost as it were in God, the Christian comes back to himself; but as it is in God that he finds himself again, he does not find himself alone. He contemplates himself as a member of God's family, and says thenceforth: *we,* and not *I. The fraternal spirit* becomes, in the second part of his prayer, the complement of the filial spirit which dictated the first; intercession is blended with personal supplication. The Lord's Prayer is thus nothing else than the summary of the law put into practice; and this summary so realized in the secrecy of the heart, will naturally pass thence into the entire life.

It appears certain from the MSS. that in the text of Luke

the invocation ought to be reduced to the single word *Father*. The following words, *which art in heaven*, are a gloss taken from Matthew, but agreeable, no doubt, to the real tenor of our Lord's saying. In this title *Father* there is expressed the double feeling of submission and confidence. The name is found in the Old Testament only in Isa. lxiii. 16 (comp. Ps. ciii. 13), and is employed only in reference to the nation as a whole. The pious Israelite felt himself the servant of Jehovah, not His child. The filial relationship which the believer sustains to God rests on the incarnation and revelation of the Son. Luke x. 22: "*He to whom the Son will reveal Him. . . .*" Comp. John i. 12.

The first two petitions relate, not to the believer himself, or the world which surrounds him, but to the honour of God; it is the child of God who is praying. Wetstein has collected a large number of passages similar to those two petitions, derived from Jewish formularies. The Old Testament itself is filled with like texts. But the originality of this first part of the Lord's Prayer is not in the words; it is in the filial feeling which is here expressed by means of those already well-known terms.—The *name of God* denotes, not His essence or His revelation, as is often said, but rather the conception of God, whatever it may be, which the worshipper bears in his consciousness—His reflection in the soul of His creatures. Hence the fact that this name dwells completely only in One Being, in Him who is the adequate image of God, and who alone knows Him perfectly; that One of whom God says, Ex. xxiii. 21, "*My name is in Him.*" Hence the fact that this name can become holier than it is — *be hallowed, rendered* holy. What unworthy conceptions of God and His character still reign among men! The child of God prays Him to assert His holy character effectually in the minds of men, in order that all impure idolatry, gross or refined, as well as all pharisaic formalism, may for ever come to an end, and that every human being may exclaim with the seraphim, in rapt adoration: *Holy, holy, holy!* (Isa. vi.) The Imper. Aor. indicates a series of acts by which this result shall be brought about.

The holy image of God once shining in glory within the depths of the heart, the kingdom of God can be established there. For God needs only to be well known in order to

reign. The term *kingdom of God* denotes an external and social state of things, but one which results from an inward and individual change. This petition expresses the longing of the child of God for that reconciled and sanctified humanity within the bosom of which the will of the Father will be done without opposition. The aor. ἐλθέτω, *come*, comprises the whole series of historical facts which will realize this state of things. The imperatives, which follow one another in the Lord's Prayer with forcible brevity, express the certainty of being heard.

The third petition, "*Thy will be . . .*," which is found in the T. R., following several MSS., is certainly an importation from Matthew. It is impossible to discover any reason why so many MSS. should have rejected it in Luke. In Matthew it expresses the state of things which will result from the establishment of the kingdom of God over humanity so admirably, that there is no reason for doubting that it belongs to the Lord's Prayer as Jesus uttered it. The position of this petition between the two preceding in a passage of Tertullian, may arise either from the fact that it was variously interpolated in Luke, or from the fact that, in consequence of the eschatological sense which was given to the term *kingdom of God*, it was thought right to close the first part of the prayer with the petition which related to that object.

Ver. 3. From the cause of God, the worshipper passes to the wants of God's *family*. The connection is this: "And that we may be able ourselves to take part in the divine work for whose advancement we pray, Give us, Forgive us," etc.—In order to serve God, it is first of all necessary that we live. The Fathers in general understood the word *bread* in a spiritual sense: *the bread of life* (John vi.); but the literal sense seems to us clearly to flow from the very general nature of this prayer, which demands at least one petition relating to the support of our present life. Jesus, who with His apostles lived upon the daily gifts of His Father, understood by experience, better perhaps than many theologians, the need which His disciples would have of such a prayer. No poor man will hesitate about the sense which is to be given to this petition.—The word ἐπιούσιος is unknown either in profane

or sacred Greek. It appears, says Origen, to have been invented by the evangelists. It may be taken as derived from ἔπειμι, *to be imminent*, whence the participle ἡ ἐπιοῦσα (ἡμέρα), *the coming day* (Prov. xxvii. 1; Acts vii. 26, *et al.*). We must then translate: "Give us day by day *next day's bread.*" This was certainly the meaning given to the petition by the Gospel of the Hebrews, where this was rendered, according to Jerome, by לחם מחר, *to-morrow's bread.* Founding on the same grammatical meaning of ἐπιούσιος, Athanasius explains it: "The bread of the world to come." But those two meanings, and especially the second, are pure refinements. The first is not in keeping with Matt. vi. 34: "*Take no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself.*" Comp. Ex. xvi. 19 et seq. It is therefore better to regard ἐπιούσιος as a compound of the substantive οὐσία, *essence, existence, goods.* No doubt ἐπι ordinarily loses its ι when it is compounded with a word beginning with a vowel. But there are numerous exceptions to the rule. Thus ἐπιεικής, ἐπίουρος (Homer), ἐπιορκεῖν, ἐπιετής (Polybius). And in the case before us, there is a reason for the irregularity in the tacit contrast which exists between the word and the analogous compound περιούσιος, *superfluous.* "Give us day by day bread *sufficient for our existence,* not what is superfluous." The expression, thus understood, exactly corresponds to that of Proverbs (xxx. 8), לחם חקי, *food convenient for me,* literally, *the bread of my allowance,* in which the term חק, *statutum,* is tacitly opposed to the *superfluity,* περιούσιον, which is secretly desired by the human heart; and it is this biblical expression of which Jesus probably made use in Aramaic, and which should serve to explain that of our passage. It has been inferred, from the remarkable fact that the two evangelists employ one and the same Greek expression, otherwise altogether unknown, that one of the evangelists was dependent on the other, or that both were dependent on a common *Greek* document. But the very important differences which we observe in Luke and Matthew, between the two editions of the Lord's Prayer, contain one of the most decisive refutations of the two hypotheses. What writer would have taken the liberty wilfully and arbitrarily to introduce such modifications into the text of a formulary beginning with the words:

"*When ye pray, say . . .*"? The differences here, still more than anywhere else, must be involuntary. It must therefore be admitted that this Greek term common to both was chosen to translate the Aramaic expression, at the time when the primitive oral tradition was reproduced in Greek for the numerous Jews speaking that language who dwelt in Jerusalem and Palestine (Acts vi. 1 et seq.). This translation, once fixed in the oral tradition, passed thence into our Gospels.

Instead of *day by day*, Matthew says σήμερον, *this day*. Luke's expression, from its very generality, does not answer so well to the character of real and present supplication. Matthew's form is therefore to be preferred. Besides, Luke employs the present δίδου, which, in connection with the expression *day by day*, must designate the permanent act: "Give us *constantly each day's* bread." The aor. δός, in Matthew, in connection with the word *this day*, designates the one single and momentary act, which is preferable.— What a reduction of human requirements to their *minimum*, in the two respects of quality (bread) and of quantity (sufficient for each day)!

Ver. 4. The deepest feeling of man, after that of his dependence for his very existence, is that of his guiltiness; and the first condition to enable him to act in the way which is indicated by the first petition, is his being relieved of this burden by pardon. For it is on pardon that the union of the soul with God rests. Instead of the word *sins*, Matthew in the first clause uses *debts*. Every neglect of duty to God really constitutes a debt requiring to be discharged by a penalty. — In the second proposition Luke says: *For we ourselves also* (αὐτοί); Matthew: *as we also* . . . The idea of an imprecation on ourselves, in the event of our refusing pardon to him who has offended us, might perhaps be found in the form of Matthew, but not in that of Luke. The latter does not even include the notion of a condition; it simply expresses a *motive* derived from the manner in which we ourselves act in our humble sphere. This motive must undoubtedly be understood in the same sense as that of ver. 13: "*If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children . . .*" "All evil as we are, we yet *ourselves* use the

right of grace which belongs to us, by remitting debts to those who are our debtors; how much more wilt not Thou, Father, who art goodness itself, use Thy right toward us!" And this is probably also the sense in which we should understand the *as also* of Matthew. The only difference is, that what Luke alleges as a motive (*for also*), Matthew states as a point of comparison (*as also*).

Luke's very absolute expression, *We forgive every one that is indebted to us,* supposes the believer to be now living in that sphere of charity which Jesus came to create on the earth, and the principle of which was laid down in the Sermon on the Mount. The term used by Jesus might be applied solely to material debts: "Forgive us our sins, for we also in our earthly relations relax our rights toward our indigent debtors." So we might explain Luke's use of the word *sins* in the first clause, and of the term ὀφείλοντι, *debtor*, in the second. This delicate shade would be lost in Matthew's form. It is possible, however, that by the words, *every one that is indebted to us,* in Luke, we are to understand not only debtors strictly so called, but every one who has offended us. The παντί is explained perhaps more easily in this wide sense of ὀφείλοντι.—This petition, which supposes the Christian always penetrated to the last (*day by day*, ver. 3) by the conviction of his sins, has brought down on the Lord's Prayer the dislike of the Plymouth Brethren, who regard it as a prayer provided rather for a Jewish than a Christian state. But comp. 1 John i. 9, which certainly applies to believers: "*If we confess* . . ."—The absence of all allusion to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for the pardon of sins is a very striking proof of the entire authenticity of this formula, both in Luke and Matthew. If Luke in particular had put into it anything of his own, even the least, would not some expression borrowed from the theology of the Epistle to the Romans have inevitably slipped from his pen?

With the feeling of his past trespasses there succeeds in the mind of the Christian that of his weakness, and the fear of offending in the future. He therefore passes naturally from sins to be forgiven to sin to be avoided. For he thoroughly apprehends that sanctification is the superstructure to be raised on the foundation of pardon. The word *tempt*

takes two meanings in Scripture—to put a free being in the position of deciding for himself between good and evil, obedience and rebellion; it is in this sense that God tempts: "*God did tempt Abraham*" (Gen. xxii. 1); or, to impel inwardly to evil, to make sin appear in a light so seducing, that the frail and deceived being ends by yielding to it; thus it is that Satan tempts, and that, according to Jas. i. 13, God *cannot tempt*. What renders it difficult to understand this last petition is, that neither of the two senses of the word *tempt* appears suitable here. If we adopt the good sense, how are we to ask God to spare us experiences which may be necessary for the development of our moral being, and for the manifestation of His glorious power in us (Jas. i. 3)? If we accept the bad sense, is it not to calumniate God, to ask Him not to do towards us an act decidedly wicked, diabolical in itself? The solution of this problem depends on our settling the question who is the author of the temptations anticipated. Now the second part of the prayer in Matthew, *But deliver us from the evil*, leaves no doubt on this point. The author of the temptations to which this petition relates is not God, but Satan. The phrase *ῥῦσαι ἀπό, rescue from*, is a military term, denoting the deliverance of a prisoner who had fallen into the hands of an enemy. The enemy is the evil one, who lays his snares in the way of the faithful. These, conscious of the danger which they run, as well as of their ignorance and weakness, pray God to preserve them from the snares of *the adversary*. The word *εἰσφέρειν* has been rendered, *to expose to*, or, *to abandon to*; but these translations do not convey the force of the Greek term, *to impel into, to deliver over to*. God certainly does not impel to evil; but it is enough for Him to withdraw His hand that we may find ourselves given over to the power of the enemy. It is the *παραδιδόναι, giving up*, of which Paul speaks (Rom. i. 24, 26–28), and by which is manifested His wrath against the Gentiles. Thus He punishes sin, that of pride in particular, by the most severe of chastisements, even sin itself. All that God needs thereto is not to act, no more to guard us; and man, given over to himself, falls into the power of the enemy (2 Sam. xxiv. 1, comp. with 1 Chron. xxi. 1). Such is the profound conviction of the believer; hence his prayer,

"Let me do nothing this day which would force Thee for a single moment to withdraw Thy hand, and to give me over to one of the snares which the evil one will plant in my way. Keep me in the sphere where Thy holy will reigns, and where the evil one has no access."[1]—The second clause, *but deliver us . . .*, is, in Luke, an interpolation derived from Matthew. Without this termination the prayer is not really closed as it ought to be. Here again, therefore, Matthew is more complete than Luke.—The doxology, with which we close the Lord's Prayer, is not found in any MS. of Luke, and is wanting in the oldest copies of Matthew. It is an appendix due to the liturgical use of this formulary, and which has been added in the text of the first Gospel, the most commonly used in public reading.

The Lord's Prayer, especially in the form given by Matthew, presents to us a complete whole, composed of two ascending and to some extent parallel series.—We think that we have established —1*st.* That it is Luke who has preserved to us most faithfully the situation in which this model prayer was taught, but that it is Matthew who has preserved the terms of it most fully and exactly. There is no contradiction, whatever M. Gess may think, between those two results. 2*d.* That the two digests can neither be derived the one from the other, nor both of them from a common document. Bleek himself is forced here to admit a separate source for each evangelist. How, indeed, with such a document, is it possible to imagine the capricious omissions in which Luke must have indulged, or the arbitrary additions which Matthew must have allowed himself? Holtzmann thinks that Matthew amplified the formulary of the *Logia* reproduced by Luke, with the view of raising the number of petitions to the (sacred) number of *seven.* But (*a*) the division into *seven* petitions is a fiction; it corresponds neither with the evident symmetry of the two parts of the prayer, each composed of *three* petitions, nor with the true meaning of the last petition, which, contrary to all reason, would require to be divided into two. (*b*) The parts peculiar to Matthew have perfect internal probability. It has been concluded from those differences that this formulary was not yet in use in the worship of the primitive Church. If this argument were valid, it would apply also to the formula instituting the holy Supper, which is untenable. The formula of the Lord's Prayer was preserved at first, like all the rest of the Gospel history, by means of oral tradition; it thus remained exposed to secondary

[1] This is what a pious man used to express in the following terms, in which he paraphrased this petition: "If the occasion of sinning presents itself, grant that the desire may not be found in me: if the desire is there, grant that the occasion may not present itself"

modifications, and these passed quite simply into the first written digests, from which our synoptical writers have drawn.

2*d.* Vers. 5–13. *The Efficacy of Prayer.*—After having declared to His own the essential objects to be prayed for, Jesus encourages them thus to pray by assuring them of the efficacy of the act. He proves this (1) by an example, that of the indiscreet friend (vers. 5–8); (2) by common experience (vers. 9 and 10); (3) by the fatherly goodness of God (vers. 11–13).

Vers. 5–8.[1] This parable is peculiar to Luke. Holtzmann says: "Taken from *A*." But why in that case has Matthew omitted it, he who reproduces from *A* both the preceding and following verses (vii. 7–11)?—The form of expression is broken after ver. 7. It is as if the importuned friend were reflecting what he should do. His friendship hesitates. But a circumstance decides him: the perseverance, carried even to shamelessness (*ἀναιδεία*), of his friend who does not desist from crying and knocking. The construction of ver. 7 does not harmonize with that with which the parable had opened (ver. 5). There were two ways of expressing the thought: either to say, "*Which of you* shall have a friend, and shall say to him . . . and [if] the latter shall answer . . . [will not persist until] . . .;" or to say, "*If one of you* hath a friend, and sayeth to him . . . and he answer him . . . [nevertheless] I say unto you . . ." Jesus begins with the first form, which takes each hearer more directly aside, and continues (ver. 7) with the second, which better suits so lengthened a statement. The reading *εἴπῃ* may be explained by the *εἴπῃ* which follows ver. 7, as the reading *ἐρεῖ* by the Futures which precede. The first has more authorities in its favour. The figure of the *three loaves* should not be interpreted allegorically; the meaning of it should follow from the picture taken as a whole. One of the loaves is for the traveller; the second for the host, who must seat himself at table with him; the third will be their reserve. The idea of full sufficiency (*ὅσων χρῄζει*) is the real application to be made of this detail.

[1] Ver. 5. A. D. K. M. P. R. Π. several Mnn. It^{plerique}: *τρεῖς* instead of *τριῶν*.—Ver. 6. 14 Mjj. 100 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. omit *μου*, which is read by the T. R. with ℵ. A. B. L. X. most of the Mnn. Syr^{cur}, It.—Ver. 8. The Mss. are divided between *ὅσων* (Alex.) and *ὅσου* (Byz.).

Vers. 9 and 10.[1] "*And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.* 10. *For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.*" Ver. 9 formally expresses the application of the preceding example; all the figures appear to be borrowed from that example. That is evident in the case of *knocking*. The word *ask* probably alludes to the cries of the friend in distress, and the word *seek* to his efforts to find the door in the night, or in endeavouring to open it. The gradation of those figures includes the idea of increasing energy in the face of multiplying obstacles.—A precept this which Jesus had learned by His personal experience (iii. 21, 22).

Ver. 10 confirms the exhortation of ver. 9 by daily experience. The Future, *it shall be opened*, which contrasts with the two Presents, *receiveth, findeth*, is used because in this case it is not the same individual who performs the two successive acts, as in the former two. The opening of the door depends on the will of another person.—How can we help admiring here the explanation afforded by Luke, who, by the connection which he establishes between this precept and the foregoing example, so happily accounts for the choice of the figures used by our Lord, and brings into view their entire appropriateness? In Matthew, on the contrary, this saying is found placed in the midst of a series of precepts, at the end of the Sermon on the Mount, detached from the parable which explains its figures; it produces the effect of a petal torn from its stalk, and lying on the spot where the wind has let it fall. Who could hesitate between the two narratives?

Vers. 11–13.[2] "*If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent?* 12. *Or if he shall ask an*

[1] Ver. 9. The Mss. are divided here, as well as at ver. 10, between ανοιχθησεται and ανοιγησεται (the second probably taken from Matthew).

[2] Ver. 11. ℵ. D. L. X. 6 Mnn. Vg. Or., τις instead of τινα.—11 Mjj. 50 Mnn. It. Vg. read εξ before υμων.—Or. Epiph. omit ο before υιος. ℵ. L. 1 Mn. $It_{aliq.}$ Vg. omit ο υιος.—All the Mjj. read, before και, ει instead of η, which the T. R. reads, with some Mnn. only.—Ver. 12. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn., η και instead of η και εαν.—Ver. 13. ℵ. D. K. M. X. Π. several Mnn., ουτις instead of υπαρχοντις. —C. U. several Mnn. Vss. add υμων after πατηρ.—ℵ. L. X. Syr. $It^{plerique}$, omit ο before εξ ουρανου.—L. 8 Mnn. Vg., πνευμα αγαθον instead of πνευμα αγιον.

egg, will he offer him a scorpion? 13. *If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him!"* Undoubtedly it sometimes happens in human relations, that the maxim of ver. 10 does not hold good. But in a paternal and filial relationship, such as that which was set before us by the model given at the beginning, success is certain. It is a Father to whom the believer prays; and when praying to Him in conformity with the model prescribed, he is sure to ask nothing except those things which such a Father cannot refuse to His child, and instead of which that Father would not give him other things, either hurtful or even less precious. The end of the piece thus brings us back to the starting-point: the title *Father* given to God, and the filial character of him who prays the Lord's Prayer. Δέ, *then*, relates to the *a fortiori*, in the certainty which we have just expressed. The reading of some Alex., τίς ... ὁ υἱός or υἱός, "*What son* shall ask of his father," would appeal to the feeling of sonship among the hearers; the reading τίνα ... is clearly to be preferred to it, "*What father* of whom his son shall ask," by which Jesus appeals to the heart of fathers in the assembly.—The three articles of food enumerated by Jesus appear at first sight to be chosen at random. But, as M. Bovet[1] remarks, loaves, hard eggs, and fried fishes, are precisely the ordinary elements of a traveller's fare in the East. Matthew omits the third; Luke has certainly not added it at his own hand. The correspondence between bread and stone, fish and serpent, egg and scorpion, appears at a glance. In the teaching of Jesus all is picturesque, full of appropriateness, exquisite even to the minutest details.—Ἐπιδιδόναι, to transfer *from hand to hand.* This word, which is not repeated in ver. 13, includes this thought: "What father *will have the courage* to put into the hand ...?"

The conclusion, ver. 13, is drawn by a new argument *a fortiori;* and the reasoning is still further strengthened by the words, *ye being evil.* The reading ὑπάρχοντες, "*finding yourselves* evil," seems more in harmony with the context than ὄντες, *being* (which is taken from Matthew, where the readings do not vary). Ὑπάρχειν denotes the actual state as the

[1] See the charming passage, *Voyage en Terre-Sainte*, p. 362, 6th ed.

starting-point for the supposed activity.—Bengel justly observes: *Illustre testimonium de peccato originali.*—The reading of the Alex., which omits ὁ before ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, would admit of the translation, *will give from heaven.* But there is no reason in the context which could have led Luke to put this construction so prominently. *From heaven* thus depends on the word *Father,* and the untranslateable Greek form can only be explained by introducing the verbal notion of *giving* between the substantive and its government: "The Father *who giveth* from heaven."—Instead of *the Holy Spirit,* Matthew says, *good things;* and De Wette accuses Luke of having corrected him in a spiritualizing sense. He would thus have done here exactly the opposite of that which has been imputed to him in respect to vi. 20! Have we not then a complete proof that Luke took this whole piece from a source peculiar to himself? As to the intrinsic value of the two expressions, that of Matthew is simple and less didactic; that of Luke harmonizes better perhaps with the elevated sphere of the Lord's Prayer, which is the starting-point of the piece. The use of the simple δώσει (instead of ἐπιδώσει, ver. 12) arises from the fact that the idea does not recur of giving from hand to hand.

We regard this piece as one of those in which the originality and excellence of Luke's sources appear in their full light, although we consider the comparison of Matthew indispensable to restore the words of our Lord in their entirety.

7. *The Blasphemy of the Pharisees:* xi. 14–36.—We have already observed (see on vi. 11) how remarkably coincident in time are the accusations called forth in Galilee by the healings on the Sabbath, and those which are raised about the same period at Jerusalem by the healing of the impotent man (John v.). There is a similar correspondence between the yet graver accusation of complicity with Beelzebub, raised against Jesus on the occasion of His healing demoniacs, and the charge brought against Him at Jerusalem at the feasts of Tabernacles and of the Dedication: "*Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil!*" (John viii. 48); "*He hath a devil, and is mad!*" (x. 20). Matthew (chap. xii.) and Mark (chap. iii.) place this accusation and the answer of Jesus much earlier, in the first part of the Galilean ministry. The accusation may

and must have often been repeated. The comparison of John would tell in favour of Luke's narrative. Two sayings which proceeded from the crowd give rise to the following discourse: the accusation of complicity with Beelzebub (ver. 15), and the demand for a sign from heaven (ver. 16). It might seem at first sight that these are two sayings simply placed in juxtaposition; but it is not so. The second is intended to offer Jesus the means of clearing Himself of the terrible charge involved in the first: "Work a miracle in the heavens, that sphere which is exclusively divine, and we shall then acknowledge that it is God who acts through thee, and not Satan." This demand in appearance proceeds from a disposition favourable to Jesus; but as those who address Him reckon on His powerlessness to meet the demand, the result of the test, in their view, will be a condemnation without appeal. Those last are therefore in reality the worst intentioned, and it is in that light that Luke's text represents them. Matthew isolates the two questions, and simply puts in juxtaposition the two discourses which reply to them (xii. 22 et seq., 38 et seq.); thus the significant connection which we have just indicated disappears. It is difficult to understand how Holtzmann and other moderns can see nothing in this relation established by Luke, but a specimen of his "[arbitrary] manner of joining together pieces which were detached in the *Logia* (*Λ*)."

This piece includes: 1*st.* A statement of the facts which gave rise to the two following discourses (vers. 14–16); 2*d.* The first discourse in reply to the accusation of ver. 15 (vers. 17–26); 3*d.* An episode showing the deep impression produced on the people by this discourse (vers. 27 and 28); 4*th.* The second discourse in reply to the challenge thrown out to Jesus, ver. 16 (vers. 29–36).

1*st.* Vers. 14–16.[1]—*Ἦν ἐκβάλλων, He was occupied in casting out.* The word *κωφός, dull,* may mean *deaf* or *dumb;* according to the end of the verse, it here denotes dumbness. On the expression *dumb devil,* see vol. i. p. 434. Bleek

[1] Ver. 14. Και αυτο ην is wanting in ℵ. B. L. 7 Mnn. Syr^cur.—A. C. L. X. 6 Mnn., εκβληθεντος instead of εξελθοντος. D. It^aliq. present this verse under a somewhat different form.—Ver. 15. A. D. K. M. X. Π. 40 Mnn. read here a long appendix taken from Mark iii. 23.

justly concludes from this term, that the dumbness was of a psychical, not an organic nature.—The construction ἐγένετο . . . ἐλάλησεν betrays an Aramaic source. The accusation, ver. 15, is twice mentioned by Matthew: ix. 32, on the occasion of a deaf man possessed, but without Jesus replying to it; then xii. 22, which is the parallel passage to ours; here the possessed man is dumb *and blind.* Should not those two miracles be regarded as only one and the same fact, the account of which was taken first (Matt. ix.) from the *Logia,* second (Matt. xii.) from the proto-Mark, as Holtzmann appears to think, therein following his system to its natural consequences? But in that case we should have the result, that the *Logia,* the collection of *discourses,* contained the fact without the discourse, and that the proto-Mark, the strictly *historical* writing, contained the discourse without the fact,—a strange anomaly, it must be confessed! In Mark iii. this accusation is connected with the step of the brethren of Jesus who come to lay hold of Him, because they have heard say that He is *beside Himself,* that He is mad (iii. 21, ὅτι ἐξέστη). This expression is nearly synonymous with that of *possessed* (John x. 20). According to this accusation, it was thus as one Himself possessed by the prince of the devils that Jesus had the power of expelling inferior devils. From this point of view, the ἐν, *through,* before the name Beelzebub, has a more forcible sense than appears at the first glance. It signifies not only by the authority of, but by Beelzebub himself dwelling personally in Jesus.—This name given to Satan appears in all the documents of Luke, and in almost all those of Matthew, with the termination *bul;* and this is certainly the true reading. It is probable, however, that the name is derived from the Heb. *Baal-Zebub, God of Flies,* a divinity who, according to 2 Kings i. et seq., was worshipped at Ekron, a city of the Philistines, and who may be compared with the Ζεὺς Ἀπομυῖος of the Greeks. The invocation of this god was doubtless intended to preserve the country from the scourge of flies. In contempt, the Jews applied this name to Satan, while modifying its last syllable so as to make it signify *God of Dung* (*Baal-Zebul*). Such is the explanation given by Lightfoot, Wetstein, Bleek, etc.—Those who raise this accusation are, in Luke, *some* of the numerous persons

present; in Matthew (ix. 34, xii. 24), *the Pharisees;* in Mark (iii. 22), *scribes which came down from Jerusalem.* This last indication by Mark would harmonize with the synchronism which we have established in regard to this accusation between Luke and John.

The demand for a sign from heaven (ver. 16) is mentioned twice in Matt. xii. 38 and xvi. 1. It is not impossible that it may have been repeated again and again (comp. John vi. 30). It corresponded with the ruling tendency of the Israelitish mind, the seeking for miracles, the σημεῖα αἰτεῖν (1 Cor. i. 22). We have already explained its bearing in the present case. In John it signifies more particularly, "Show thyself superior to Moses." In those different forms it was ever the repetition of the third temptation (πειράζοντες, *tempting* Him). How, indeed, could Jesus avoid being tempted to accept this challenge, and so to confound by an act of signal power the treacherous accusation which He found raised against Him!

2*d. The First Discourse:* vers. 17–26.—It is divided into two parts: Jesus refutes this blasphemous explanation of His cures (vers. 17–19); He gives their true explanation (vers. 20–26).

Vers. 17–19.—"*But He, knowing their thoughts, said unto them: Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and one house falls upon another.* 18. *If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out devils through Beelzebub.* 19. *And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges.*"—In vers. 17 and 18 Jesus appeals to the common sense of His hearers; it is far from natural to suppose that the devil would fight against himself. It is true, it might be rejoined that Satan drove out his underlings, the better to accredit Him as his Messiah. Jesus does not seem to have referred to this objection. In any case, the sequel would answer it; the devil can remove the diabolical spirit, but not replace it by the Holy Spirit. Διανοήματα, *their thoughts,* denotes the wicked source concealed behind such words (vers. 15 and 16). The words, "*And one house falls upon another,*" appear to be in Luke the development of the ἐρημοῦται, *is brought to desolation:* the ruin of families, as a consequence of civil discord. In

Matthew and Mark they evidently include a new example, parallel to the preceding one. This sense is also admissible in Luke, if we make the object ἐπὶ οἶκον depend, not on πίπτει, but on διαμερισθείς . . . : "*And likewise a house divided against a house falls.*"—The εἰ δὲ καί, ver. 18, here signifies, *and entirely so if* . . . In the appendix, *because ye say*, there is revealed a deep feeling of indignation. This emphatic form recalls that of Mark (iii. 30): "*Because they* said, He hath an unclean spirit." The two analogous terms of expression had become fixed in the tradition (comp. v. 24 and parall.; see also on xiii. 18); but their form is sufficiently different to prove that the one evangelist did not copy from the other.

By this first reply Jesus has simply enlisted common sense on His side. He now thrusts deeper the keen edge of His logic, ver. 19. If the accusation raised against Him is well-founded, His adversaries must impute to many of the sons of Israel the same compact with Satan. We know from the N. T. and Josephus, that there were at that time numerous Jewish exorcists who made a business of driving out devils for money (Acts xix. 13: "*Certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists* . . ." Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* viii. 2. 5[1]). The Talmud also speaks of those exorcists, who took David, healing Saul by his songs, as their patron, and Solomon as the inventor of their incantations: "They take roots, fumigate the patient, administer to him a decoction, and the spirit vanishes" (Tauch. f. 70, 1). Such are the persons whom

[1] "I have seen one of my countrymen, named Eleazar, who in the presence of Vespasian and his sons, captains and soldiers, delivered persons possessed with devils. The manner of his cure was this: Bringing close to the nostrils of the possessed man his ring, under the bezel of which there was enclosed one of the roots prescribed by Solomon, he made him smell it, and thus gradually he drew out the demon through the nostrils. The man then fell on the ground, and the exorcist commanded the demon to return into him no more, uttering all the while the name of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. Wishing to convince the bystanders of the power which he exercised, and to demonstrate it to them, Eleazar placed a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon to overturn it as he went out of the man, and thereby to furnish proof to the spectators that he had really quitted him. That having taken place, the knowledge and wisdom of Solomon were evident to all." Comp. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 3, where the magical root mentioned, a sort of rue (πήγανον), is called *Baara*, from the name of the valley where it was gathered with infinite trouble, near the fortress of Machærus.

Jesus designated by the expression, *your sons.* Several Fathers have thought that He meant His own apostles, who also wrought like cures; but the argument would have had no value with Jews, for they would not have hesitated to apply to the cures wrought by the disciples the explanation with which they had just stigmatized those of the Master. De Wette, Meyer, and Neander give to the word *sons* the meaning which it has in the expression *sons of the prophets,* that of disciples. But is it proved that those exorcists studied in the Rabbinical schools? Is it not simpler to explain the term *your sons* in this sense: "Your own countrymen,—your flesh and blood,—whom you do not think of repudiating, but from whom, on the contrary, you take glory when they perform works of power similar to mine; they do not work signs in the heavens, and yet you do not suspect their cures. They shall confound you therefore before the divine tribunal, by convicting you of having applied to me a judgment which you should with much stronger reason have applied to them." In reality, what a contrast was there between the free and open strife which Jesus maintained with the malignant spirits whom He expelled, and the suspicious manipulations in which those exorcists indulged! between the entire physical and moral restoration which His word brought to the sick who were healed by Him, and the half cures, generally followed by relapses, which they wrought! To ascribe the imperfect cures to God, and to refer the perfect cures to the devil—what logic!

Vers. 20–26. After having by this new *argumentum ad hominem* refuted the supposition of His adversaries, Jesus gives the true explanation of His cures by contrasting the picture of one of those expulsions which He works (vers. 20–22) with that of a cure performed by the exorcists (vers. 23–26).

Vers. 20–22.—"*But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you.* 21. *When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace.* 22. *But when a stronger than he shall come upon him and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils.*" Ver. 20 draws the conclusion (δέ, *now*; ἄρα, *then*) from the preceding arguments,

and forms the transition to the two following scenes. In this declaration there is betrayed intense indignation: "Let them take heed! The kingdom of God, for which they are waiting, is already there without their suspecting it; and it is upon it that their blasphemies fall. They imagine that it will come with noise and tumult; and it has come more quickly than they thought, and far otherwise it has *reached* them (ἔφθασεν). The construction ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, *upon you*, has a threatening sense. Since they set themselves in array against it, it is an enemy which has surprised them, and which will crush them. The term *finger of God* is admirably in keeping with the context: the arm is the natural seat and emblem of strength; and the finger, the smallest part of the arm, is the symbol of the ease with which this power acts. Jesus means, "As for me, I have only to lift my finger to make the devils leave their prey." These victories, so easily won, prove that henceforth Satan has found his conqueror, and that now God begins really to reign. This word, full of majesty, unveils to His adversaries the grandeur of the work which is going forward, and what tragic results are involved in the hostile attitude which they are taking towards it. Instead of *by the finger of God*, Matthew says *by the Spirit of God;* and Weizsäcker, always in favour of the hypothesis of a common document, supposes that Luke has designedly replaced it by another, because it seemed to put Jesus in dependence on the Holy Spirit. What may a man not prove with such criticism? Is it not simpler, with Bleek, to regard the figurative term of Luke as the original form in the saying of Jesus, which has been replaced by the abstract but radically equivalent expression of Matthew?—Mark omits the two verses 19 and 20. Why would he have done so, if he had had before his eyes the same document as the others?

Vers. 21 and 22 serve to illustrate the thought of ver. 20: the citadel of Satan is plundered; the fact proves that Satan is vanquished, and that *the kingdom of God is come.* A strong and well-armed warrior watches at the gate of his fortress. So long as he is in this position (ὅταν), all is tranquil (ἐν εἰρήνῃ) in his fastness; his captives remain chained, and his booty (σκῦλα) is secure. The warrior is Satan (the art. ὁ alludes to a single and definite personality);

his castle is the world, which up till now has been his confirmed property. His armour consists of those powerful means of influence which he wields. His booty is, first of all, according to the context, those possessed ones, the palpable monuments of his sway over humanity; and in a wider sense, that humanity itself, which with mirth or groans bears the chains of sin. But a warrior superior in strength has appeared on the world's stage; and from that moment all is changed. Ἐπάν, *from the time that*, denotes the abrupt and decisive character of this succession to power, in opposition to ὅταν, *as long as*, which suited the period of security. This stronger man is Jesus (the art. ὁ also alludes to His definite personality). He alone can really plunder the citadel of the prince of this world. Why? Because He alone began by conquering him in single combat. This victory in a personal engagement was the preliminary condition of His taking possession of the earth. It cannot be doubted that, as Keim and Weizsäcker acknowledge, Jesus is here thinking of the scene of His temptation. That spiritual triumph is the foundation laid for the establishment of the kingdom of God on the earth, and for the destruction of that of Satan. As soon as a man can tell the prince of this world to his face, "Thou hast nothing in me" (John xiv. 30), the *stronger* man, the vanquisher of the *strong* man, is come; and the plundering of his house begins. This plundering consists, first of all, of the healings of the possessed wrought by Jesus. Thus is explained the ease with which He performs those acts by which He rescues those unhappy ones from malignant powers, and restores them to God, to themselves, and to human society. All the figures of this scene are evidently borrowed from Isa. xlix. 24, 25, where Jehovah Himself fills the part of liberator, which Jesus here ascribes to Himself.

Vers. 23-26.[1] "*He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.* 24. *When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seek-*

[1] Ver. 24. ℵᶜ. B. L. X. Z. some Mnn. It[allq]. read τοτε after ευρισκον.—The Mss. are divided between ευρισκον and ευρισκων, and at ver. 25 between ελθον and ελθων.—Ver. 25. ℵᶜ. B. C. L. R. Γ. 12 Mnn. It[allq]. read σχολαζοντα after ευρισκει (taken from Matthew).—Ver. 26. The Mss. are divided between εισελθοντα and ελθοντα.

ing rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. 25. *And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished.* 26. *Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first.*"—The relation between ver. 23 and the verses which precede and follow has been thought so obscure by De Wette and Bleek, that they give up the attempt to explain it. In itself the figure is clear. It is that of a troop which has been dispersed by a victorious enemy, and which its captain seeks to rally, after having put the enemy to flight; but false allies hinder rather than promote the rallying. Is it so difficult to understand the connection of this figure with the context? The dispersed army denotes humanity, which Satan has conquered; the chief who rallies it is Jesus; the seeming allies, who have the appearance of fighting for the same cause as He does, but who in reality scatter abroad with Satan, are the exorcists. Not having conquered for themselves the chief of the kingdom of darkness, it is only in appearance that they can drive out his underlings; in reality, they serve no end by those alleged exploits, except to strengthen the previous state of things, and to keep up the reign of the ancient master of the world. Such is the object which the following illustration goes to prove. By the thrice-repeated ἐμοῦ, me, of ver. 23, there is brought into relief the decisive importance of the part which Jesus plays in the history of humanity; He is the impersonation of the kingdom of God; His appearance is the advent of a new power. The words σκορπίζειν, *to disperse*, and συνάγειν, *to gather together*, are found united in the same sense as here, John x. 13-16.

The two following verses serve to illustrate the saying of ver. 23, as vers. 21 and 22 illustrated the declaration of ver. 20. They are a sort of apologue poetically describing a cure wrought by the means which the exorcists employ, and the end of which is to show, that to combat Satan apart from Christ, his sole conqueror, is to work for him and against God; comp. the opposite case, ix. 49, 50. The exorcist has plied his art; the impure spirit has let go his prey, quitted his dwelling, which for the time has become intolerable to him. But two things are wanting to the cure to make it

real and durable. First of all, the enemy has not been conquered, bound; he has only been expelled, and he is free to take his course of the world, perhaps to return. Jesus, on the other hand, sent the malignant spirits to their prison, the abyss whence they could no longer come forth till the judgment (viii. 31, iv. 34). Then the house vacated is not occupied by a new tenant, who can bar the entrance of it against the old one. Jesus, on the contrary, does not content Himself with expelling the demon; He brings back the soul to its God; He replaces the unclean spirit by the Holy Spirit. As a relapse after a cure of this sort is impossible, so is it probable and imminent in the former case. Every line of the picture in which Jesus represents this state of things is charged with irony. The spirit driven out walks *through dry places.* This strange expression was probably borrowed from the formulas of exorcism. The spirit was relegated to the desert, the presumed abode of evil spirits (Tob. viii. 3; Baruch iv. 35). The reference was the same in the symbolical sending of the goat into the wilderness *for Azazel,* the prince of the devils.

But the malignant spirit, after roaming for a time, begins to regret the loss of his old abode; would it not be well, he asks himself, to return to it? He is so sure that he needs only to will it, that he exclaims with sarcastic gaiety: I will return *unto my house.* At bottom he knows very well that he has not ceased to be the proprietor of it; a proprietor is only dispossessed in so far as he is replaced. First he determines to reconnoitre. Having come, he finds that the house is disposable (σχολάζοντα, Matt.). He finds what is better still: the exorcist has worked with so much success, that the house has recovered a most agreeable air of propriety, order, and comfort since his departure. Far, therefore, from being closed against the malignant spirit, it is only better prepared to receive him. Jesus means thereby to describe the restoration of the physical and mental powers conferred by the half cures which He is stigmatizing. Anew there is a famous work of destruction to be accomplished—Satan cares for no other—but this time it is not to be done by halves. And therefore there is need for reinforcement. Besides, it is a festival; there is need of friends. The evil spirit goes off to

seek a number of companions sufficient to finish the work which had been interrupted. These do not require a second bidding, and the merry crew throw themselves into their dwelling. This time, we may be sure, nothing will be wanting to the physical, intellectual, and moral destruction of the possessed. Such was the state in which Jesus had found the Gergesene demoniac (viii. 29), and probably also Mary Magdalene (viii. 2). This explains in those two cases the words *Legion* (viii. 30) and *seven devils* (viii. 2), which are both symbolical expressions for a desperate state resulting from one or more relapses.—Nothing is clearer than this context, or more striking than this scene, in which it is impossible for us to distinguish fully between what belongs to the idea and what to the figure. Thus has Jesus succeeded in retorting upon the exorcists, so highly extolled by His adversaries, the reproach of being auxiliaries of Satan, which they had dared to cast on Him. Need we wonder at the enthusiasm which this discourse excited in the multitude, and at the exclamation of the woman, in which this feeling of admiration finds utterance?

3*d*. Vers. 27, 28.[1] *The Incident.*—"*And it came to pass, as He spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto Him, Blessed is the womb that bare Thee, and the paps which Thou hast sucked.* 28. *But He said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.*" Perhaps, like Mary Magdalene, this woman had herself experienced the two kinds of healing which Jesus had been contrasting. In any case, living in a society where scenes of the kind were passing frequently, she had not felt the same difficulty in apprehending the figures as we, to whom they are so strange.—Jesus in His answer neither denies nor affirms the blessedness of her who gave Him birth. All depends on this, if she shall take rank in the class of those whom alone He declares to be blessed. The true reading appears to be μενοῦνγε, μενοῦν. —"There is undoubtedly a blessedness;" γε (the restricting particle as always): "*at least* for those who . . ."

Does not this short account bear in itself the seal of its historical reality? It is altogether peculiar to Luke, and suffices to demon-

[1] Ver. 28. The Mss. are divided between μενουνγε (T. R.) and μενουν (Alex.).—8 Mjj. 15 Mnn. It. omit αυτον after φυλασσοντες.

strate the originality of the source from which this whole piece was derived. For this incident could not possibly stand as a narrative by itself; it must have formed part of the account of the entire scene.

The allegorical tableau, ver. 24 et seq., is set by Matthew in an altogether different place, and so as to give it a quite different application (xii. 43 et seq.). The words with which it closes, "*Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation,*" prove that it is applied in that Gospel to the Jewish people taken collectively. The old form of possession was the spirit of idolatry; that of the present, seven times worse, is the Rabbinical pride, the pharisaic formalism and hypocrisy, which have dominion over the nation in the midst of its monotheistic zeal. The stroke which will fall upon it will be seven times more terrible than that with which it was visited when it was led into captivity in Jeremiah's day. This application is certainly grand and felicitous. But it forces us entirely to separate this scene, vers. 24–26, as the first Gospel does, from the preceding, vers. 21, 22, which in Matthew as well as in Luke can only refer to the healing of cases of possession; and yet those two scenes are indisputably the pendants of one another. Gess understands the application of this word in Matthew to the Jewish people in a wholly different sense. The first cure, according to him, was the enthusiastic impulse of the people in favour of Jesus in the beginning of His Galilean ministry; the relapse referred to the coldness which had followed, and which had obliged Jesus to teach in parables. But nowhere does Jesus make so marked an allusion to that crisis, to which probably the conscience of the people was not awakened. Would it not be better in this case to apply the first cure to the powerful effect produced by John the Baptist? "Ye were willing *for a season,*" says Jesus Himself, "to rejoice in his light" (John v. 35). Anyhow, what leads Matthew to convert the second scene into a national apologue, instead of leaving it with its demonological and individual application, is his insertion, immediately before, of the saying which relates to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit,—a saying which in Mark also follows the scene of the combat between *the strong man* and *the stronger man.* When, after so grave an utterance, Matthew returns to the scene (omitted by Mark) of the spirit recovering possession of his abandoned dwelling, he must necessarily give it a different bearing from that which it has in Luke. The superiority of Luke's account cannot appear doubtful to the reader who has caught the admirable connection of this discourse, and the striking meaning of all the figures which Jesus uses to compose those two scenes. As to the true position of the saying about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, the question will be discussed chap. xii.

4th. Vers. 29–36. *The Second Discourse.*—This is the answer of Jesus to the demand which was addressed to Him to work a miracle proceeding from heaven (ver. 16). Strauss does not think that Jesus could have reverted to so secondary a

question after the extremely grave charge with which He had been assailed. We have already pointed out the relation which exists between those two subjects. The miracle proceeding from heaven was claimed from Jesus as the only means He had of clearing Himself from the suspicion of complicity with Satan. In the first part of His reply, Jesus speaks of the only sign of the kind which shall be granted to the nation (vers. 29–32); in the second, of the entire sufficiency of this sign in the case of every one who has the eye of his soul open to behold it (vers. 33–36).

Vers. 29–32.[1] *The Sign from Heaven.*—"*And when the people thronged together, He began to say, This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas.* 30. *For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation.* 31. *The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.* 32. *The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here.*" —During the previous scene, a crowd, growing more and more numerous, had gathered; and it is before it that Jesus gives the following testimony against the national unbelief. In the πονηρά, *wicked*, there is an allusion to the diabolical spirit which had dictated the call for a sign (πειράζοντες, ver. 16). —The point of comparison between Jonas and Jesus, according to Luke, appears at first sight to be only the fact of their preaching, while in Matt. xii. 39, 40 it is evidently the miraculous deliverance of the one and the *resurrection* of the other. M. Colani concludes from this difference that Matthew has materialized the comparison which Jesus gave forth in a purely moral sense (Luke).[2] But it must not be forgotten that Jesus says in Luke, as well as in Matthew: "The Son of man *shall be* (ἔσται) a sign," by which He cannot denote

[1] Ver. 29. 5 Mjj. repeat γενεα after αυτη, read ζητει instead of επιζητει, and omit the words του προφητου (taken from Matthew).—Ver. 32. 12 Mjj. 80 Mnn. Syr[sch]. It. read Νινευιται instead of Νινευι.

[2] *Jésus Christ et les croyances Messianiques*, etc., p. 111.

His present preaching and appearance, the Fut. necessarily referring to an event yet to come,—an event which can be no other than the entirely exceptional miracle of His resurrection. They ask of Jesus a sign ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, *proceeding from heaven*, ver. 16. His resurrection, in which no human agency intervenes, and in which divine power appears alone, fully satisfies, and only satisfies, this demand. This is the feature which Peter asserts in Acts ii. 24, 32, iii. 15, etc.: "*God* hath raised up Jesus." In John ii. 19, Jesus replies to a similar demand by announcing the same event. The thought in Luke and Matthew is therefore exactly the same: "It was as one who had miraculously escaped from death that Jonas presented himself before the Ninevites, summoning them to anticipate the danger which threatened them; it is as the risen One that I (by my messengers) shall proclaim salvation to the men of this generation." Which of the two texts is it which reproduces the answer of our Lord most exactly? But our passage may be parallel with Matt. xvi. 4, where the form is that of Luke. As to the words of Matt. xii. 39, 40, they must be authentic. No one would have put into the mouth of Jesus the expression, *three days and three nights*, when Jesus had actually remained in the tomb only one day and two nights.

But how shall this sign, and this preaching which will accompany it, be received? It is to this new thought that vers. 31 and 32 refer. Of the two examples which Jesus quotes, Matthew puts that of the Ninevites first, that of the queen of Sheba second. Luke reverses the order. Here again it is easy to perceive the superiority of Luke's text. 1. Matthew's order has been determined by the natural tendency to bring the example of the Ninevites into immediate proximity with what Jesus has been saying of Jonas. 2. Luke's order presents an admirable gradation: while the wisdom of Solomon sufficed to attract the queen of Sheba from such a distance, Israel demands that to the infinitely higher wisdom of Jesus there should be added a sign from heaven. This is serious enough. But matters will be still worse: while the heathen of Nineveh were converted by the voice of Jonas escaped from death, Israel, at the sight of Jesus raised from the dead, shall not be converted.—Comp.

as to the Queen of the South, 1 Kings x. 1 et seq. *Seba* seems to have been a part of Arabia-Felix, the modern Yemen. Ἐγερθήσεται, *shall rise up* from her tomb on the day of the great awakening, *at the same time as* the Jews (μετά, *with*, not *against*), so that the blindness of the latter shall appear in full light, contrasted with the earnestness and docility of the heathen queen. The word ἀνδρων, "the *men* of this generation," certainly indicates a contrast with her female sex. Indeed, this term ἄνδρες, *men*, does not reappear in the following example, where *this generation* is not compared with a woman. Perhaps the choice of the first instance was suggested to Jesus by the incident which had just taken place, vers. 27, 28.—The word ἀναστήσονται, ver. 32, *shall rise up*, denotes a more advanced degree of life than ἐγερθήσονται (*shall awake*). These dead are not rising from their tombs, like the queen of Sheba; they are already in their place before the tribunal as accusing witnesses. How dramatic is everything in the speech of Jesus! and what variety is there in the smallest details of His descriptions!

Vers. 33–36.[1] *The Spiritual Eye.*—"*No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under the bushel, but on the candlestick, that they which come in may see the light.* 34. *The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy whole body is full of darkness.* 35. *Take heed, therefore, that the light which is in thee be not darkness.* 36. *If thy whole body, therefore, be full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light.*"—Christ,—such is the *sign from heaven* whose light God will diffuse over the world. He is the lamp which gives light to the house. God has not lighted it to allow it to be banished to an obscure corner; He will put it on a candlestick, that it may shine before the eyes of all; and this He will do by means of the resurrection.

[1] Ver. 33. ℵ. B. C. D. U. r. several Mnn. Syr. It[aliq.] omit δι after ουδεις. Instead of κρυπτον, which the T. R. reads, with some Mnn., all the other documents read κρυπτην.—The Mss. are divided between το φεγγος (T. R.) and το φως (Alex.), which appears to be taken from viii. 16.—Ver. 34. 6 Alex. add σου after οφθαλμος (the first).—ℵ. B. D. L. a. It. Vg. omit ουν after οταν.—K. L. M. X. π. some Mnn. It[aliq.], ισται instead of ιστιν.—K. M. U. X. π. 50 Mnn. It[plerique], add ισται after σκοτεινον.—Ver. 36. D. Syr[cur]. It[plerique], omit this verse.

Κρυπτήν, a place out of view, under a bed, *e.g.* (viii. 16). *Τὸν μόδιον*, not *a* bushel, but *the* bushel; there is but one in the house, which serves in turn as a measure, a dish, or a lantern.[1]—But it is with this sign in relation to our soul, as with a lamp relatively to our body, ver. 34. To the light which shines without there must be a corresponding organ in the individual fitted to receive it, and which is thus, as it were, the lamp *within*. On the state of this organ depends the more or less of light which we receive from the external luminary, and which we actually enjoy. In the body this organ, which by means of the external light forms the light of the whole body, the hand, the foot, etc., is the eye; everything, therefore, depends on the state of this organ. For the soul it is—Jesus does not say what, He leaves us to guess—*the heart*, *καρδία*; comp. Matt. vi. 21 and 22. The understanding, the will, the whole spiritual being, is illuminated by the divine light which the heart admits. With every motion in the way of righteousness there is a discharge of light over the whole soul. *Ἁπλοῦς*, *single*, and hence in this place,—which is in its original, normal state; *πονηρός*, *corrupted*, and hence diseased, in the meaning of the phrase *πονηρῶς ἔχειν to be ill*. If the Jews were right in heart, they would see the divine sign put before their eyes as easily as the Queen of the South and the Ninevites perceived the less brilliant sign placed before them; but their heart is perverse: that organ is diseased; and hence the sign shines, and will shine, in vain before their view. The light without will not become light *in them*.

Ver. 35. It is supremely important, therefore, for every one to watch with the greatest care over the state of this precious organ. If the eye is not enlightened, what member of the body will be so? The foot and hand will act in the darkness of night. So with the faculties of the soul when the heart is perverted from good.—Ver. 36. But what a contrast to this condition is formed by that of a being who opens his heart fully to the truth, his spiritual eye to the brightness of the lamp which has been lighted by God Himself! To avoid the tautology which the two members of the verse seem to present, we need only put the emphasis diffe-

[1] M. F. Bovet, *Voyage en Terre-Sainte*, p. 312.

rently in the two propositions: in the first on ὅλον, *whole;* and in the second on φωτεινόν, *full of light,* connecting this word immediately with the following as its commentary: *full of light as when* . . . The very position of the words forbids any other grammatical explanation; and it leads us to this meaning: "When, through the fact of the clearness of thine eye, thy whole body shall be penetrated with light, without there being in thee the least trace of darkness, then the phenomenon which will be wrought in thee will resemble what takes place on thy body when it is placed in the rays of a luminous focus." Jesus means, that from the inward part of a perfectly sanctified man there rays forth a splendour which glorifies the external man, as when he is shone upon from without. It is glory as the result of holiness. The phenomenon described here by Jesus is no other than that which was realized in Himself on the occasion of His transfiguration, and which He now applies to all believers. Passages such as 2 Cor. iii. 18 and Rom. viii. 29 will always be the best commentary on this sublime declaration, which Luke alone has preserved to us, and which forms so perfect a conclusion to this discourse.

Bleek having missed the meaning of this saying, and of the piece generally, accuses Luke of having placed it here without ground, and prefers the setting which it has in Matthew, in the middle of the Sermon on the Mount, immediately after the maxim: "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Undoubtedly this context of Matthew proves, as we have recognised, that the eye of the soul, according to the view of Jesus, is the heart. But what disturbs the purity of that organ is not merely avarice, as would appear from the context of Matt. vi. It is sin in general, perversity of heart hostile to the light; and this more general application is precisely that which we find in Luke. This passage has been placed in the Sermon on the Mount, like so many others, rather because of the association of ideas than from historical reminiscence. The context of Luke, from xi. 14 to ver. 36, is without fault. On the one side the accusation and demand made by the enemies of Jesus, vers. 15, 16, on the other the enthusiastic exclamation of the believing woman, vers. 27, 28, furnish Jesus with the starting-points for His two contrasted descriptions,—that of growing blindness which terminates in midnight darkness, and that of gradual illumination which leads to perfect glory. We may, after this, estimate the justness of Holtzmann's judgment: "It is impossible to connect this passage about light, in a simple and natural way, with the discourse respecting Jonas."

8. *The Dinner at a Pharisee's House:* xi. 37–xii. 12.—Agreeably to the connection established by Luke himself (xii. 1), we join the two pieces xi. 37–54 and xii. 1–12 in one whole. Here, so far as Galilee is concerned, we have the culminating point of the struggle between Jesus and the pharisaic party. This period finds its counterpart in Judea, in the scenes related John viii.–x. The background of the conflict which now ensues, is still the odious accusation refuted in the previous passage. The actual situation assigned to the repast is, according to Holtzmann, merely a fiction, the idea of which had been suggested to Luke by the figures of vers. 39 and 40. Is it not more natural to suppose that the images of vers. 39 and 40 were suggested to Jesus by the actual situation, which was that of a repast? It is true, a great many of the sayings which compose this discourse are found placed by Matthew in a different connection; they form part of the great discourse in which Jesus denounced the divine malediction on the scribes and Pharisees in the temple a few days before His death (Matt. xxiii.). But first it is to be remarked, that Holtzmann gives as little credit to the place which those sayings occupy in the composition of Matthew, as to the "scenery" of Luke. Then we have already found too many examples of the process of aggregation used in the first Gospel, to have our confidence shaken thereby in the narrative of Luke. We shall inquire, therefore, with impartiality, as we proceed, which of the two situations is that which best suits the words of Jesus.

This piece contains: 1*st.* The rebukes addressed to the Pharisees (vers. 37–44); 2*d.* Those addressed to the scribes (vers. 45–54); 3*d.* The encouragements given to the disciples in face of the animosity to which they are exposed on the part of those enraged adversaries (xii. 1–12).

1*st. To the Pharisees:* vers. 37–44.—Vers. 37 and 38.[1] *The Occasion.*—This Pharisee had probably been one of the hearers of the previous discourse; perhaps one of the authors of the accusation raised against Jesus. He had invited Jesus along with a certain number of his own colleagues (vers. 45 and 53), with the most malevolent intention. Thus is

[1] Ver. 38. Instead of ἰδων ἐθαυμασεν οτι, D. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}, Vg. Tert.: ἠρξατο διακρινομενος εν εαυτω λεγειν διατι.

explained the tone of Jesus (ver. 39 et seq.), which some commentators have pronounced impolite (!). The reading of some Fathers and Vss., "He began to *doubt* (or to *murmur*, as διακρίνεσθαι sometimes means in the LXX.), and to say," is evidently a paraphrase.—Ἄριστον, the morning meal, as δεῖπνον, the principal meal of the day. The meaning of the expression εἰσελθὼν ἀνέπεσεν is this: He seated Himself without ceremony, as He was when He entered. The Pharisees laid great stress on the rite of purification before meals (Mark vii. 2–4; Matt. xv. 1–3); and the Rabbins put the act of eating with unwashed hands in the same category as the sin of impurity. From the surprise of His host, Jesus takes occasion to stigmatize the false devotion of the Pharisees; He does not mince matters; for after what has just passed (ver. 15), war is openly declared. He denounces: 1*st*. The hypocrisy of the Pharisees (vers. 39–42); 2*d*. Their vainglorious spirit (ver. 43); 3*d*. The evil influence which their false devotion exercises over the whole people (ver. 44).

Vers. 39–42.[1] *Their Hypocrisy.*—"*And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness.* 40. *Ye fools, did not He that made that which is without, make that which is within also?* 41. *Rather give alms of such things as are within; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.* 42. *But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue, and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.*"—God had appointed for His people certain washings, that they might cultivate the sense of moral purity in His presence. And this is what the Pharisees have brought the rite to; multiplying its applications at their pleasure, they think themselves excused thereby from the duty of heart purification. Was it possible to go more directly in opposition to the divine intention: to destroy the practice of the duty by their practices, the end by the means? Meyer and Bleek translate *νῦν, now*, in the sense of time: "Things have *now* come to such a pass with you . . ." It is more natural to give it the logical sense which it often has: "Well now! There you are, you Pharisees! I take you in the act." If,

[1] Ver. 42. ℵ°. B. L. 2 Mnn., παριναι instead of αφιναι.

in the second member of the verse, the term τὸ ἔσωθεν, *the inward part*, was not supplemented by ὑμῶν, *your* inward part, the most natural sense of the first member would be this: "Ye make clean the outside of the vessels in which ye serve up the repast to your guests." Bleek maintains this meaning for the first proposition, notwithstanding the ὑμῶν in the second, by joining this pron. to the two substantives ἁρπαγῆς and πονηρίας: "But the inside [of the cups and platters] is full [of the products] of *your* ravenings and *your* wickedness." But, 1. This connection of ὑμῶν is forced; 2. Ver. 40 does not admit of this sense, for we must understand by *Him who made both that which is without and that which is within*, the potter who made the plates, the goldsmith who fashioned the cups, which is absurd. As in ver. 40 the ὁ ποιήσας, *He that made*, is very evidently the Creator, *the inward part*, ver. 40 and ver. 39, can only be that of man, the heart. We must therefore allow an ellipsis in ver. 39, such as frequently occurs in comparisons, and by which, for the sake of conciseness, one of the two terms is suppressed in each member of the comparison: "Like a host who should set before his guests plates and cups perfectly cleansed outside, [but full of filth inside], 39*a*, ye think to please God by presenting to Him [your bodies purified by lustrations, but at the same time] your inward part full of ravening and wickedness, 39*b*." The *inward part* denotes the whole moral side of human life. Ἁρπαγή, *ravening*—avarice carried out in act; πονηρία, *wickedness*—the inner corruption which is the source of it. Jesus ascends from sin in act to its first principle.

The apostrophe, *ye fools*, ver. 40, is then easily understood, as well as the argument on which it rests. God, who made the body, made the soul also; the purification of the one cannot therefore, in His eyes, be a substitute for the other. A well-cleansed body will not render a polluted soul acceptable to Him, any more than a brightly polished platter will render distasteful meat agreeable to a guest; for *God is a spirit*. This principle lays pharisaism in the dust. Some commentators have given this verse another meaning, which Luther seems to adopt: "The man who has made (pure) the outside, has not thereby made (pure) the inside." But this meaning of ποιεῖν is inadmissible, and the οὐχ heading the proposition

proves that it is interrogative.—The meaning of the parallel passage in Matt. xxiii. 25, 26 is somewhat different: "The contents of the cup and platter must be purified by filling them only with goods lawfully acquired; in this way, the outside, should it even be indifferently cleansed, will yet be sufficiently pure." It is at bottom the same thought, but sufficiently modified in form, to prove that the change cannot be explained by the use of one and the same written source, but must arise from oral tradition.—To the rebuke administered there succeeds the counsel, ver. 41. We have translated πλήν by *rather*. The literal sense, *excepting*, is thus explained: "All those absurdities swept away, here is *what alone remains*." At first sight, this saying appears to correspond with the idea expressed in Matthew's text, rather than with the previous saying in Luke. For the expression τὰ ἔνοντα, *that which is within*, cannot in this verse refer to the inward part *of man*, but denotes undoubtedly the contents of the cups and platters. But it is precisely because τὰ ἔνοντα, *that which is within*, is not at all synonymous with ἔσωθεν, *the inward part*, in the preceding context, that Luke has employed a different expression. *Τὰ ἔνοντα, the contents* of the cups and platters, denotes what remains in those vessels at the close of the feast. The meaning is: "Do you wish, then, that those meats and those wines should not be defiled, and should not defile you? Do not think that it is enough for you carefully to wash your hands before eating; there is a surer means: let some poor man partake of them. It is the spirit of love, O ye Pharisees, and not material lustrations, which will purify your banquets." *Καὶ ἰδού, and behold;* the result will be produced as if by magic. Is it not selfishness which is the real pollution in the eyes of God? The δότε, *give*, is opposed to ἁρπαγή, *ravening*, ver. 39.—This saying by no means includes the idea of the merit of works. Could Jesus fall into pharisaism at the very moment when He was laying it in the dust? Love, which gives value to the gift, excludes by its very nature that seeking of merit which is the essence of pharisaism.

The ἀλλά, *but*, ver. 42, sets the conduct of the Pharisees in opposition to that which has been described ver. 41, in order to condemn them by a new contrast; still, however, it

is the antithesis between observances and moral obedience. Every Israelite was required to pay the tithe of his income (Lev. xxvii. 30; Num. xviii. 21). The Pharisees had extended this command to the smallest productions in their gardens, such as mint, rue, and herbs, of which the law had said nothing. Matthew mentions other plants, anise and cummin (xxiii. 23). Could it be conceived that the one writer could have made so frivolous a change on the text of the other, or on a common document?—In opposition to those pitiful returns, which are their own invention, Jesus sets the fundamental obligations imposed by the law, which they neglect without scruple. *Κρίσις, judgment;* here the discernment of what is just, the good sense of the heart, including justice and equity (Sirach xxxiii. 34). Matthew adds ἔλεος and *πίστις, mercy* and *faith,* and omits the *love* of God, which Luke gives. The two virtues indicated by the latter correspond to the two parts of the summary of the law.—The moderation and wisdom of Jesus are conspicuous in the last words of the verse; He will in no wise break the old legal mould, provided it is not kept at the expense of its contents.

Ver. 43.[1] *Vainglory.*—"*Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets.*"—The uppermost seats in the synagogues were reserved for the doctors. This rebuke is found more fully developed, xx. 45–47.

Ver. 44. *Contagious Influence.*—"*Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them.*"—Jesus by this figure describes the moral fact which He elsewhere designates as *the leaven of the Pharisees.* According to Num. xix. 16, to touch a grave rendered a man unclean for eight days, as did the touch of a dead body. Nothing more easy, then, than for one to defile himself by touching with his foot a grave on a level with the ground, without even suspecting its existence. Such is contact with the Pharisees; men think they have to do with saints: they yield themselves up to their influence, and become infected

[1] Ver. 43. ℵ. B. C. L. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}, omit γραμματεις και Φαρισαιοι υποκριται, which the T. R. here adds with the other documents (taken from Matthew).

with their spirit of pride and hypocrisy, against which they were not put on their guard. In Matthew (xxiii. 27), the same figure receives a somewhat different application. A man looks with complacency at a sepulchre well built and whitened, and admires it. But when, on reflection, he says: Within there is nothing save rottenness, what a different impression does he experience! Such is the feeling which results from observing the Pharisees.—That the two texts should be borrowed from the same document, or taken the one from the other, is quite as inconceivable as it is easy to understand how oral tradition should have given to the same figure those two different applications.

2*d. To the Scribes:* vers. 45–54. A remark made by a scribe gives a new turn to the conversation. The Pharisees were only a religious party; but the scribes, the experts in the law, formed a profession strictly so called. They were the learned, *the wise*, who discovered nice prescriptions in the law, such as that alluded to in ver. 42, and gave them over for the observance of their pious disciples. The scribes played the part of clerical guides. The majority of them seem to have belonged to the pharisaic party; for we meet with no others in the N. T. But their official dignity gave them a higher place in the theocracy than that of a mere party. Hence the exclamation of him who here interrupts Jesus: "Thus saying, Thou reproachest us, *us scribes also*," which evidently constitutes in his eyes a much graver offence than that of reproaching the Pharisees. In His answer Jesus upbraids them on three grounds, as He had done the Pharisees: 1*st.* Religious intellectualism (ver. 46); 2*d.* Persecuting fanaticism (vers. 47–51); 3*d.* The pernicious influence which they exercised on the religious state of the people (ver. 52).—Vers. 53 and 54 describe the end of the feast.

Vers. 45 and 46.[1] *Literalism.*—"*Then answered one of the lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also.* 46. *And He said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.*"—There seems to be no essential difference between the terms

[1] Ver. 46. G. M. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., ἐπὶ τῷ δακτύλῳ instead of ἐπὶ τῶν δακτύλων.

νομικός, νομοδιδάσκαλος, and γραμματεύς. See ver. 53; and comp. ver. 52 with Matt. xxiii. 13. Yet there must be a shade of difference at least between the words; according to the etymology, νομικός denotes the expert, the casuist, who discusses doubtful cases, the Mosaic jurist, as Meyer says; νομοδιδάσκαλος, the doctor, the professor who gives public or private courses of Mosaic law; γραμματεύς would include in general all those who are occupied with the Scriptures, either in the way of theoretical teaching or practical application.

Our Lord answers the scribe, as He had answered the Pharisee, in three sentences of condemnation. The first rebuke is the counterpart of that which He had addressed in the first place to the latter, to wit, literalism; this is the twin brother of formalism. The paid scribes were infinitely less respectable than the generality of the Pharisees. As to those minute prescriptions which they discovered daily in the law, and which they recommended to the zeal of devotees, they had small regard for them in their own practice. They seemed to imagine that, so far as they were concerned, the *knowing* dispensed with the *doing*. Such is the procedure characterized by Jesus in ver. 46. Constantly drawing the heaviest burdens from the law, they bind them on the shoulders of the simple. But as to themselves, they make not the slightest effort to lift them.

Vers. 47–51.[1] *Persecuting Orthodoxy.*—"*Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them.* 48. *Truly ye are witnesses that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres.* 49. *Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute:* 50. *That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation;* 51. *From the blood of Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation.*" Head religion is almost always connected with hatred of living piety, or spiritual religion, and readily becomes

[1] Ver. 47. ℵ*. C., και οι instead of οι δε.—Ver. 48. ℵ. B. L., μαρτυρεις εστε instead of μαρτυρειτε (taken from Matthew).—ℵ. B, D. L. It^{talliq}. omit αυτων τα μνημεια after οικοδομειτε.—Ver. 49. Marcion omitted vers. 49–51.

persecuting.—All travellers, and particularly Robinson, mention the remarkable tombs, called tombs of the prophets, which are seen in the environs of Jerusalem. It was perhaps at that time that the Jews were busied with those structures; they thought thereby to make amends for the injustice of their fathers. By a bold turn, which translates the external act into a thought opposed to its ostensible object, but in accordance with its real spirit, Jesus says to them: "Your fathers killed; ye bury; therefore ye continue and finish their work." In the received reading, *μαρτυρεῖτε, ye bear witness,* signifies: "When ye bury, ye give testimony to the reality of the bloodshed committed by your fathers." But the Alex. reading *μάρτυρές ἐστε, ye are witnesses,* is undoubtedly preferable. It includes an allusion to the official part played by witnesses in the punishment of stoning (Deut. xvii. 7; Acts vii. 58). It is remarkable that the two terms *μάρτυς, witness,* and *συνευδοκεῖν, to approve,* are also found united in the description of Stephen's martyrdom. They seem to have had a technical significance. Thus: "Ye take the part of witnesses and consummators of your fathers' crimes." The reading of the Alex., which omit *αὐτῶν τὰ μνημεῖα, their graves,* at the end of ver. 48, has a forcible conciseness. Unfortunately those MSS. with the T. R. read *αὐτούς* after *ἀπέκτειναν*; and this regimen of the first verb appears to settle that of the second.—In connection with the conduct of the Jews toward their prophets, whom they slew, and honoured immediately after their death, the saying has been rightly quoted: *sit licet divus, dummodo non vivus.*—The parallel passage in Matthew (xxiii. 29–31) has a rather different sense: "*Ye say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets; Wherefore ye witness against yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets.*" The oneness of sentiment is here proved, not by the act of building the tombs, but by the word *children.* The two forms show such a difference, that they could not proceed from one and the same document. That of Luke appears every way preferable. In Matthew, the relation between the words put by Jesus into the mouth of the Jews, ver. 30, and the building of the tombs, ver. 29, is not clear.

Διὰ τοῦτο καί: "And because the matter is really so, not-

withstanding appearances to the contrary, the wisdom of God hath said." What does Jesus understand by the *wisdom of God?* Ewald, Bleek, etc., think that Jesus is here quoting a lost book, which assigned this saying to the wisdom of God, or which itself bore this title. Bleek supposes that the quotation from this book does not go further than to the *vaí*, ver. 51; the discourse of Jesus is resumed at the words, *Verily I say unto you.* But, 1. The discourses of Jesus present no other example of an extra-canonical quotation; 2. The term *apostle*, in what follows, seems to betray the language of Jesus Himself; 3. The thought of vers. 50 and 51 is too profound and mysterious to be ascribed to any human source whatever. According to Meyer, we have indeed a saying of Jesus here; but as it was repeated in oral tradition, it had become a habit, out of reverence for Jesus, to quote it in this form: *The wisdom of God* (Jesus) *said, I send . . .* Comp. Matt. xxiii. 34: *I send* (ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω). This form of quotation was mistakenly regarded by Luke as forming part of the discourse of Jesus. But Luke has not made us familiar thus far with such blunders; and the διὰ τοῦτο, *on account of this*,—which falls so admirably into the context of Luke, and which is found identically in Matthew, where it has, so to speak, no meaning (as Holtzmann acknowledges, p. 228),—is a striking proof in favour of the exactness of the document from which Luke draws. Baur thinks that by the word, *the wisdom of God*, Luke means to designate the Gospel of Matthew, itself already received in the Church as God's word at the time when Luke wrote. But it must first be proved that Luke knew and used the Gospel of Matthew. Our exegesis at every step has proved the contrary; besides, we have no example of an apostolical author having quoted the writing of one of his colleagues with such a formula of quotation. Neander and Gess think that here we have a mere parenthesis inserted by Luke, in which he reminds us in passing of a saying which Jesus in point of fact did not utter till later (Matt. xxiii.). An interpolation of this kind is far from natural. The solitary instance which could possibly be cited (Luke vii. 29, 30) seems to us more than doubtful.

Olshausen asserts that Jesus intends an allusion to the

words (2 Chron. xxiv. 19): *"He sent prophets to them, to bring them again unto Him; but they would not receive them."* But the connection between those two sayings is very indirect. I think there is a more satisfactory solution. The book of the O. T. which in the primitive Church as well as among the Jews, in common with the books of Jesus Sirach and Wisdom, bore the name of *σοφία*, or *wisdom of God*, was that of Proverbs.[1] Now here is the passage which we find in that book (i. 20–31): *"Wisdom uttereth her voice in the streets, and crieth in the chief places of concourse . . . Behold, I will pour out my Spirit upon you* (LXX., *ἐμῆς πνοῆς ῥῆσιν*), *and I will make known my words unto you . . . But ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof. Therefore I will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh . . .* (and I shall say), *Let them eat of the fruit of their works!"* This is the passage which Jesus seems to me to quote. For the breath of His Spirit, whom God promises to send to His people to instruct and reprove them, Jesus substitutes the living organs of the Spirit—His apostles, the new prophets; then He applies to the Jews of the day (ver. 49*b*) the sin of obstinate resistance proclaimed in the same passage; finally (vers. 50, 51), He paraphrases the idea of final punishment, which closes this prophecy. The parallelism seems to us to be complete, and justifies in the most natural manner the use of the term, *the wisdom of God*. By the words *prophets and apostles* Jesus contrasts this new race of the Spirit's agents, which is to continue the work of the old, with the men of the dead letter, with those scribes whom He is now addressing. The lot which lies before them at the hands of the latter, will be precisely the same as the prophets had to meet at the hands of their fathers; thus to the sin of the fathers there will be justly added that of the children, until the measure be full. It is a law of the Divine government, which controls the lot of societies as well as that of individuals, that God does not correct a development once commenced by premature judgment. While still warning the sinner, He leaves his sin to

[1] Clemens Rom., Irenæus, Hegesippus call it *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία*; Melito (according to the reading *ἡ καί*, Eus. iv. 33, ed. Lœmm.) *σοφία*. See Wieseler, *Stud. und Kritik.* 1856, 1.

ripen; and at the appointed hour He strikes, not for the present wickedness only, but for all which preceded. The continuous unity of the sin of the fathers involves their descendants, who, while able to change their conduct, persevere and go all the length of the way opened up by the former. This continuation on the part of the children includes an implicit assent, in virtue of which they become accomplices, responsible for the entire development. A decided breaking away from the path followed was the only thing which could avail to rid them of this terrible implication in the entire guilt. According to this law it is that Jesus sees coming on the Israel round about Him the whole storm of wrath which has gathered from the torrents of innocent blood shed since the beginning of the human race. Comp. the two threatenings of St. Paul, which look like a commentary on this passage (Rom. ii. 3–5; 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16).

Jesus quotes the first and last examples of martyrdoms mentioned in the canonical history of the old covenant. Zacharias, the son of the high priest Jehoiada, according to 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, was stoned in the temple court by order of King Joash. As Chronicles probably formed the last book of the Jewish canon, this murder, the last related in the O. T., was the natural counterpart to that of Abel. Jesus evidently alludes to the words of Genesis (iv. 10), "*The voice of thy brother's blood crieth from the ground,*" and to those of the dying Zacharias, "*The Lord look upon it, and require it.*" Comp. ἐκζητηθῇ, ver. 50, and ἐκζητηθήσεται, ver. 51 (in Luke). If Matthew calls Zacharias the *son of Barachias*, it may be reconciled with 2 Chron. xxiv. by supposing that Jehoiada, who must then have been 130 years of age, was his grandfather, and that the name of his father Barachias is omitted because he had died long before. Anyhow, if there was an error, it must be charged against the compiler of the first Gospel (as is proved by the form of Luke), not against Jesus.

Ver. 52: *The Monopoly of Theology.*—"*Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.*" The religious despotism with which Jesus in the third place charges the scribes, is a natural consequence of

their fanatical attachment to the letter. This last rebuke corresponds to the third which He had addressed to the Pharisees—the pernicious influence exercised by them over the whole people. Jesus represents *knowledge* (γνῶσις) under the figure of a temple, into which the scribes should have led the people, but whose gate they close, and hold the key with jealous care. This knowledge is not that of the gospel, a meaning which would lead us outside the domain of the scribes; it is the real living knowledge of God, such as might already be found, at least to a certain extent, in the O. T. The *key* is the Scriptures, the interpretation of which the scribes reserved exclusively to themselves. But their commentaries, instead of tearing aside the veil of the letter, that their hearers might penetrate to the spirit, thickened it, on the contrary, as if to prevent Israel from beholding the face of the living God who revealed Himself in the O. T., and from coming into contact with Him. The pres. part. εἰσερχόμενοι denotes those who were ready to rise to this vital knowledge, and who only lacked the sound interpretation of Scripture to bring them to it.

Matthew, in a long discourse which he puts into the mouth of Jesus in the temple (chap. xxiii.), has combined in one compact mass the contents of those two apostrophes addressed to the Pharisees and lawyers, which are so nicely distinguished by Luke. Jesus certainly uttered in the temple, as Matthew relates, a vigorous discourse addressed to the scribes and Pharisees. Luke himself (xx. 45–47) indicates the time, and gives a summary of it. But it cannot be doubted that here, as in the Sermon on the Mount, the first Gospel has combined many sayings uttered on different occasions. The distribution of accusations between the Pharisees and lawyers, as we find it in Luke, corresponds perfectly to the characters of those two classes. The question of the scribe (ver. 45) seems to be indisputably authentic. Thus Luke shows himself here again the historian properly so called.

Vers. 53 and 54:[1] *Historical Conclusion.*—These verses

[1] Ver. 53. ℵ. B. C. L. read κακεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτου instead of λεγοντος . . . αὐτους.—L. S. V. Δ. several Mnn., ἀποστομιζειν instead of ἀποστόματιζειν.—Ver. 54. ℵ. X. omit αὐτον after ἐνεδρευοντες.—15 Mjj. Syr. It. read ζητουντες

describe a scene of violence, perhaps unique, in the life of Jesus. Numerous variations prove the very early alteration of the text. According to the reading of the principal Alex., *And when He had gone thence*, this scene must have taken place after Jesus had left the Pharisee's house; but this reading seems designed to establish a closer connection with what follows (xii. 1 et seq.), and produces the impression of a gloss. On the other hand, the omission of the words, *and seeking,* and *that they might accuse Him,* in B. L. (ver. 54), renders the turn of expression more simple and lively. The reading ἀποστομίζειν (*to blunt*) has no meaning. We must read ἀποστοματίζειν, *to utter*, and then *to cause to utter*.

3*d. To the Disciples:* xii. 1–12.—This violent scene had found its echo outside; a considerable crowd had flocked together. Excited by the animosity of their chiefs, the multitude showed a disposition hostile to Jesus and His disciples. Jesus feels the need of turning to His own, and giving them, in presence of all, those encouragements which their situation demands. Besides, He has uttered a word which must have gone to their inmost heart, *some of you they will slay and persecute,* and He feels the need of supplying some counterpoise. Thus is explained the exhortation which follows, and which has for its object to raise their courage and give them boldness in testifying. Must not one be very hard to please, to challenge, as Holtzmann does, the reality of a situation so simple?

Jesus encourages His apostles: 1*st.* By the certainty of the success of their cause (vers. 1–3); 2*d.* By the assurance which He gives them as to their persons (vers. 4–7); 3*d.* By the promise of a glorious recompense, which He contrasts with the punishment of the timid, and of their adversaries (vers. 8–10); *finally,* By the assurance of powerful aid (vers. 11, 12).

Vers. 1–3:[1] *The assured Success of their Ministry, and the Fall of their Adversaries.*—"*In the meantime, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch*

instead of και ζητουντες; ℵ. B. L. omit these words.—ℵ. B. L. omit να κατηγορησωσιν αυτου.

[1] Ver. 1. Instead of εν οις . . . οχλων, D. It[plerique], Vg., πολλων δε οχλων συνπιμπλαμενων κυκλω.—Tert. Vg. omit πρωτον.

that they trode one upon another, He began to say unto His disciples first of all: Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. 2. *For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known.* 3. *Therefore, whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house-tops.*" The words ἐν οἷς, *on which*, establish a close connection between the following scene and that which precedes. This gathering, which is formed as in the previous scene (xi. 29), is readily explained by the general circumstances—those of a journey. When Jesus had arrived at a village, some time was needed to make the population aware of it; and soon it flocked to Him *en masse*. Ἤρξατο, *He began*, imparts a solemn character to the words which follow. Jesus, after having spoken severely to His adversaries, now addresses the little company of His disciples, lost among that immense throng, in language full of boldness. It is the cry *onwards*, with the promise of victory. The words, *to the disciples*, are thus the key to the discourse following. The word πρῶτον, *before all*, should evidently be connected with the verb which follows, *beware ye*. Comp. ix. 61, x. 5.—Meyer concludes, from the absence of the article before ὑπόκρισις, that the leaven is not hypocrisy itself, but a style of teaching which has the character of hypocrisy. This is a very forced meaning. The absence of the article is very common before terms which denote virtues and vices. (Winer, *Gramm. des N. T. Sprachidioms*, § 19. 1.) Leaven is the emblem of every active principle, good or bad, which possesses the power of assimilation. The devotion of the Pharisees had given a false direction to the whole of Israelitish piety (vers. 39, 44). This warning may have been repeated several times (Mark viii. 13; Matt. xvi. 6).

The δέ adversative of ver. 2 determines the sense of the verse: "But all this pharisaic hypocrisy shall be unveiled. The impure foundation of this so vaunted holiness shall come fully to the light, and then the whole authority of those masters of opinion shall crumble away; but, *in place thereof* (ἀνθ' ὧν, ver. 3), those whose voice cannot now find a hearing, save within limited and obscure circles, shall become the teachers of the world." The Hillels and Gamaliels will give

place to new teachers, who shall fill the world with their doctrine, and those masters shall be Peter, John, Matthew, here present! This substitution of a new doctorate for the old is announced in like manner to Nicodemus (John iii. 10, 11). Here, as there, the poetical rhythm of the parallelism indicates that elevation of feeling which arises from so great and transporting a thought. Comp. the magnificent apostrophe of St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 20: "*Where is the wise? Where is the scribe . . .?*" By St. Paul's time the substitution had been fully effected.—*Ταμεῖον, the larder* (from *τέμνω*); and hence the locked chamber, the innermost apartment, in opposition to the public room.—The roofs of houses in the East are terraces, from which one can speak with those who are in the street. This is the emblem of the greatest possible publicity. The mouth of the scribes shall be stopped, and the teaching of the poor disciples shall be heard over the whole universe. The apophthegms of vers. 2 and 3 may be applied in many ways, and Jesus seems to have repeated them often with varied applications. Comp. viii. 17. In the parallel passage (Matt. x. 27), the matter in question is the teaching of Jesus, not that of the apostles; and this saying appears in the form of an exhortation addressed to the latter: "*What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light.*" Naturally the maxim which precedes (ver. 2 of Luke) should also receive a different application in Matthew (ver. 26): "Everything that is true must come to the light. Publish, therefore, without fear whatsoever I have told you."

Vers. 4–7.[1] *Personal Security.*—"*And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do.* 5. *But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear Him which, after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell: yea, I say unto you, fear Him.* 6. *Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings; and not one of them is forgotten before God?* 7. *But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows.*"—The success of their cause is certain. But what of their personal future? After xi. 49

[1] Ver. 4. 5 Mjj. 10 Mnn. read *πιρισσον* instead of *πιρισσοτιρον*.—Ver. 7. B. L. R. It[aliq], omit *ουν* after *μη*.—6 Mjj. 60 Mnn. Vg. add *υμιις* after *διαφιρισι* (taken from Matthew).

there was good cause for some disquiet on this point. Here the heart of Jesus softens: the thought of the lot which some of them will have to undergo seems to render His own more dear to Him. Hence the tender form of address, *To you, my friends.* Certainly Luke did not invent this word; and if Matthew, in whom it is not found (x. 28 et seq.), had used the same document as Luke, he would not have omitted it. Olshausen has taken up the strange idea, that by him who can cast into hell we are to understand, not God, but the devil, as if Scripture taught us to fear the devil, and not rather to resist him to his face (1 Pet. v. 9; James iv. 7).— The MSS. are divided between the forms ἀποκτεννόντων (Eolico-Doric, according to Bleek), ἀποκτενόντων (a corruption of the preceding), and ἀποκτεινόντων (the regular form). The term *Gehenna* (hell) properly signifies *valley of Hinnom* (גי הנם, Josh. xv. 8, comp. xviii. 16; 2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 31, etc.). It was a fresh and pleasant valley to the south of the hill of Zion, where were found in early times the king's gardens. But as it was there that the worship of Moloch was celebrated under the idolatrous kings, Josiah converted it into a place for sewage. The valley thus became the type, and its name the designation, of hell. This saying of Jesus distinguishes soul from body as emphatically as modern spiritualism can do. What are we to think of M. Renan, who dares to assert that Jesus did not know the exact distinction between those two elements of our being!

Jesus does not promise His disciples that their life shall always be safe. But if they perish, it will not be without the consent of an all-powerful Being, who is called their Father. The sayings which follow express by the most forcible emblems the idea of a providence which extends to the smallest details of human life.—To make a more appreciable sum, Luke speaks of five birds of the value of about two farthings. Matthew, who speaks of two birds only, gives their value at one farthing; that is, a little dearer. Did five cost proportionally a little less than two? Can we imagine one of the two evangelists amusing himself by making such changes in the text of the other, or in that of a common document! The expression *before God* is Hebraistic; it means that there is not one of those small creatures which is not individually

present to the view of divine omniscience. The knowledge of God extends not only to our persons, but even to the most insignificant parts of our being,—to those 140,000 hairs of which we lose some every day without paying the least attention. No fear, then; ye shall not fall without God's consent; and if He consent, it is because it will be for His child's good.

Vers. 8-10.[1] *The Recompense of faithful Disciples, contrasted with the Punishment of the Cowardly, and with that of Adversaries.*—"*Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God.* 9. *But he that denieth me before men, shall be denied before the angels of God.* 10. *And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven.*" The profession of the gospel may undoubtedly cost the disciples dear; but if they persevere, it assures them of a magnificent recompense. Jesus, when glorified, will requite them by declaring them *His* before the heavenly throng, for what they did for Him by acknowledging Him *their Lord* below at the time of His humiliation. The gnostic Heracleon remarked the force of the prep. ἐν with ὁμολογεῖν. It expresses the rest of faith *in* Him who is confessed. Ver. 9 guards the disciples against the danger of denial. This warning was by no means out of place at the time when they were surrounded by furious enemies. It is to be remarked that Jesus does not say *He will deny* the renegade, as He said that *He would confess* the confessor. The verb is here in the passive, as if to show that this rejection will be a self-consummated act.

Ver. 10 glances at a danger more dreadful still than that of being rejected as a timid disciple. This punishment may have an end. But the sin of which ver. 10 speaks is for ever unpardonable. This terrible threat naturally applies to the sin of the adversaries of Jesus, to which His thought recurs in closing. They sin, not through timidity, but through active malice. By the expression *blaspheme against the Holy Spirit*

[1] Ver. 8. ℵ. D. read ὅτι after ὑμῖν.—Marcion omitted τῶν ἀγγέλων.—Ver. 9. A. D. K. Q. Π. 20 Mun., ἔμπροσθεν instead of the first ἐνώπιον (according to Matthew).

Jesus alludes to the accusation which had given rise to this whole conflict (xi. 15), and by which the works of that divine agent in the hearts of men (comp. Matt. xii. 28, "If I cast out devils *by the Spirit of God*") had been ascribed to the spirit of darkness. That was knowingly and deliberately to insult the holiness of the principle from which all good in human life proceeds. To show the greatness of this crime of high treason, Jesus compares it with an outrage committed against His own person. He calls the latter a simple *word* (λόγον), an imprudent word, not a *blasphemy*. To utter a word against the poor and humble Son of man is a sin which does not necessarily proceed from malice. Might it not be the position of a sincerely pious Jew, who was still ruled by prejudices with which he had been imbued by his pharisaic education, to regard Jesus not as the expected Messiah, but as an enthusiast, a visionary, or even an impostor? Such a sin resembles that of the woman who devoutly brought her contribution to the pile of Huss, and at the sight of whom the martyr exclaimed, *Sancta simplicitas*. Jesus is ready to pardon in this world or in the next every indignity offered merely to His person; but an insult offered to goodness as such, and to its living principle in the heart of humanity, the Holy Spirit, the impious audacity of putting the holiness of His works to the account of the spirit of evil,—that is what He calls *blaspheming the Holy Spirit*, and what He declares unpardonable. The history of Israel has fully proved the truth of this threatening. This people perished not for having nailed Jesus Christ to the cross. Otherwise Good Friday would have been the day of their judgment, and God would not have continued to offer them for forty years the pardon of their crime. It was its rejection of the apostolic preaching, its obstinate resistance to the Spirit of Pentecost, which filled up the measure of Jerusalem's sin. And it is with individuals as with that nation. The sin which is for ever unpardonable, is not the rejection of the truth, in consequence of a misunderstanding, such as that of so many unbelievers who confound the gospel with this or that false form, which is nothing better than its caricature. It is hatred of holiness as such,—a hatred which leads men to make the gospel a work of pride or fraud, and to ascribe it to the spirit of evil. This

is not to sin against Jesus personally; it is to insult the divine principle which actuated Him. It is hatred of goodness itself in its supreme manifestation.

The form in which Matthew (xii. 31, 32) has preserved this warning differs considerably from that of Luke; and that of Mark (iii. 28, 29) differs in its turn from that of Matthew. It is wholly inconceivable, that in a statement of such gravity the evangelists arbitrarily introduced changes into a written text which they had before their eyes. On the contrary, we can easily understand how this saying, while circulating in the churches in the shape of oral tradition, assumed somewhat different forms. As to the place assigned to this declaration by the synoptics, that which Matthew and Mark give, immediately after the accusation which called it forth, appears at first sight preferable. Nevertheless, the connection which it has in Luke's context with what precedes and what follows, is not difficult to apprehend. There is at once a gradation in respect of the sin of weakness mentioned ver. 9, and a contrast to the promise of vers. 11 and 12, where this Holy Spirit, the subject of blasphemy on the part of the Pharisees, is presented as the powerful support of the persecuted disciples. There is thus room for doubt.

Vers. 11 and 12.[1] *The Aid.*—"*When they bring you unto the synagogues, and before magistrates and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say:* 12. *For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.*"—Jesus seems to take pleasure in enumerating all the different kinds of powers whose hostility they shall have to feel.—Συναγωγαί, the Jewish tribunals, having a religious character; ἀρχαί, Gentile authorities, purely civil, from provincial prefects up to the emperor; ἐξουσίαι, any power whatsoever. But let them not make preparation to plead! Their answer will be supplied to them on the spot, both as to its form (πῶς, *how*) and substance (τί, *what*). And their part will not be confined to defending themselves; they will take the offensive; they will bear testimony (τί εἴπητε, *what ye shall say*). In this respect, also, everything

[1] Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg., ισφιρωσιν instead of προσφιρωσιν. D. It$^{aliq.}$, φιρωσιν.—ℵ. D. R. some Mnn., ις instead of κι.—ℵ. B. L. Q. R. X. some Mnn., μιριμνησητι instead of μεριμνατε.—D. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit η τι.

shall be given them. Witness Peter and Stephen before the Sanhedrim, St. Paul before Felix and Festus; they do not merely defend their person; they preach the gospel. Thus the Holy Spirit will so act in them, that they shall only have to yield themselves to Him as His mouthpiece. The parallel passage occurs in Matthew in the instructions given to the Twelve (x. 19, 20). The form is different enough to prove that the two compilations are not founded on the same text. Comp. also a similar thought (John xv. 26, 27).—This saying attests the reality of the psychological phenomenon of inspiration. Jesus asserts that the Spirit of God can so communicate with the spirit of man, that the latter shall be only the organ of the former.

Holtzmann sees in all those sayings, xii. 1–12, only a combination of materials arbitrarily connected by Luke, and placed here in a fictitious framework. A discourse specially addressed to the disciples seems to him out of place in the midst of this crowd (p. 151). Yet he cannot help making an exception of vers. 1–3, which may be regarded as suitably spoken before a large multitude. But if we admit ever so little the historical truth of the striking words, *I say unto you, you my friends* (ver. 4), we must acknowledge that they serve to distinguish the disciples from other persons present, and who are not of the same mind. The promise addressed to faithful confessors (ver. 9) also receives from the hostile surroundings a quite peculiar appropriateness. The threat of ver. 10 supposes the presence of adversaries who have calumniated Jesus. In short, the announcement of persecutions, and the promise of the Holy Spirit's aid, vers. 11, 12, find a natural explanation if, at the very moment, the disciples were in a perilous situation. All the elements of this discourse are thus in perfect keeping with the historical frame in which it is set by Luke. And this frame is only an invention of the evangelist!

9. *The Position of Man and of the Believer in relation to this World's Goods:* xii. 13–59.—The occasion of this new discourse is supplied by an unexpected event, and without any relation to what had just happened. This piece embraces: 1*st.* A historical introduction (vers. 13, 14); 2*d.* A discourse addressed by Jesus to the *multitude* on the value of earthly goods to man in general (vers. 15–21); 3*d.* A discourse, which He addresses specially to the *disciples,* on the position which their new faith gives them in respect of those goods (vers. 22–40); 4*th.* A still more special application of the same truth to the *apostles* (vers. 41–53); 5*th.* In closing,

Jesus returns to the *people*, and gives them a last warning, based on the threatening character of present circumstances (vers. 54–59).

1*st. The Occasion:* vers. 13 and 14.[1]—A man in the crowd profits by a moment of silence to submit a matter to Jesus which lies heavily on his heart, and which probably brought him to the Lord's presence. According to the civil law of the Jews, the eldest brother received a double portion of the inheritance, burdened with the obligation of supporting his mother and unmarried sisters. As to the younger members, it would appear from the parable of the prodigal son that the single share of the property which accrued to them was sometimes paid in money. This man was perhaps one of those younger members, who was not satisfied with the sum allotted to him, or who, after having spent it, still claimed, under some pretext or other, a part of the patrimony. As on other similar occasions (the woman taken in adultery), Jesus absolutely refuses to go out of His purely spiritual domain, or to do anything which might give Him the appearance of wishing to put Himself in the place of the powers that be. The answer to the τίς, *who?* is this: neither God nor men.—The difference between the *judge* and the μεριστής, him who *divides*, is that the first decides the point of law, and the second sees the sentence executed.—The object of Jesus in this journey being to take advantage of all the providential circumstances which could not fail to arise, in order to instruct the people and His disciples, He immediately uses this to bring before the different classes of His hearers those solemn truths which are called forth in His mind by the unexpected event.

Holtzmann is obliged to acknowledge the reality of the fact mentioned in the introduction. He therefore alleges, that in this special case the common source of Matthew and Luke contained a historical preface, and that the latter has preserved it to us, such as it was. We accept for Luke the homage rendered in this case to his fidelity. But, 1*st.* With what right can it be pretended that we have here something exceptional? 2*d.* How can it be alleged that the occasion of the following discourse was expressly indicated in the *Logia*, and that, nevertheless, in the face of this precise datum, the author of the first Gospel allowed himself to distribute the

[1] Ver. 14. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. read κριτην instead of δικαστην (perhaps following Acts vii. 27, 35, Tischendorf).

discourse as follows: two fragments (vers. 22–31, and 33, 34) in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 25–33, 19–21); another fragment (vers. 51–53) in the installation discourse to the Twelve (Matt. x. 34–36); finally, various passages in the great eschatological discourse (Matt. xxiv. and xxv.)? Weizsäcker feels the impossibility of such a procedure. According to him, Matthew has preserved to us the form of the discourse exactly as it appeared in the *Logia*. But what does Luke in his turn do? Drawing from those great discourses of the *Logia* the materials which suit him, he forms a new one, purely fanciful, at the head of which he sets as the origin a historical anecdote of his own invention! In what respect is this procedure better than that which Holtzmann ascribes to Matthew? Such are the psychological monstrosities in opposite directions to which men are reduced by the hypothesis of a common document.

2*d. To the People:* vers. 15–21.[1] *The Rich Fool.*—Πρὸς αὐτούς ("He said *unto them*"), ver. 15, stands in opposition to *His disciples*, ver. 22. This slight detail confirms the exactness of Luke, for faith is nowhere supposed in those to whom the warning, vers. 15–21, is addressed. The two imperatives *take heed* and *beware* might be regarded as expressing only one idea: "Have your eyes fully open to this enemy, avarice;" but they may be translated thus: "Take heed [to this man] and beware." Jesus would set him as an example before the assembled people. The Greek term, which we translate by *covetousness*, denotes the desire of having, much more than that of keeping what we have. But the second is included in the first. Both rest on a superstitious confidence in worldly goods, which are instinctively identified with happiness. But to enjoy money there is a condition, viz. life, and this condition is not guaranteed by money.—Περισσεύειν, the surplus of what one has beyond what he needs. The prep. ἐν may be paraphrased by *though* or *because*: "*Though he has* or *because he has* superabundance, he has not for all that assurance of life." The two senses come nearly to the same. We should probably read πάσης, *all* covetousness, instead of τῆς, covetousness *in general*: the desire of having in every shape.

[1] Ver. 15. 13 Mjj. 40 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., πασης instead of της, which the T. R. reads with 9 Byz. and the Mnn.—7 Mjj. (Byz.) 60 Mnn., αυτω instead of αυτου after ζωη.—The Mss. are divided between αυτου (T. R.) and αυτω after υπαρχοντων.—Ver. 18. ℵ. D. some Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}, omit και τα αγαθα μου. —Ver. 20. 13 Mjj. (Alex.) several Mnn., αφρων instead of αφρον.

Ver. 16. The term *parable* may signify an *example* as well as an image; when the example is fictitious, it is invented as an *image* of the abstract truth.—This rich farmer has a superabundance of goods sufficient for years; but all in vain, his superfluity cannot guarantee his life even till to-morrow.—He speaks to *his soul* (נפש), the seat of his affections, as if it belonged to him ("*my* soul;" comp. the four μοῦ, vers. 17 and 18); and yet he is about to learn that this soul itself is only lent him.—The words: "God said *unto him*," express more than a decree; they imply a warning which he hears inwardly before dying. The subject of ἀπαιτοῦσιν (the present designates the immediate future) is neither murderers nor angels; it is the indefinite pron. *on, they,* according to a very common Aramaic form; comp. ver. 48 and xiv. 35. *This night* is the antithesis of *many years,* as *required* is that of the expression "*my* soul."

Ver. 21. Application of the parable. The phrase *laying up treasure for himself* is sufficiently explained by ver. 19.—*Rich toward God* might signify, rich in spiritual goods. But the prep. εἰς, *in relation to,* is unfavourable to this meaning. It is better to take it in the sense of laying up a treasure *in the presence of God,* in the sense of the saying, *He who giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord.* To become God's creditor, is to have a treasure *in God;* comp. vers. 33, 34.

3*d. To the Disciples:* vers. 22–40. Disengagement from earthly goods.—The following exhortations suppose faith. The believer should renounce the pursuit of earthly goods: 1. From a feeling of entire confidence as to this life in his heavenly Father (vers. 22–34); 2. From his preoccupation with spiritual goods, after which exclusively he aspires, and because he is awaiting the return of the Master to whom he has given himself (vers. 35–40).

Vers. 22–24.[1] Disengagement as resulting from confidence in the omnipotence and fatherly goodness of God.—"*And He said unto His disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on.* 23. *The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment.* 24. *Consider the ravens: for they*

[1] Ver. 22. ℵ. A. B. D. L. Q. 10 Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit ὑμῶν after ψυχῇ.—Ver. 23. 7 Mjj. 25 Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ add γάρ after ἡ.

neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye better than the fowls?" The words *unto His disciples*, ver. 22, are the key of this discourse; it is only to believers that Jesus can speak as He proceeds to do. Not only should the believer not aim at possessing superabundance, he should not even disquiet himself about the necessaries of life. Of the family of God (ver. 34), the disciples of Jesus may reckon on the tender care of this heavenly Master in whose service they are working, and that in respect of *food* as well as *clothing*.—*Therefore:* because this false confidence in riches is folly. Ver. 22 formally states the precept; ver. 23 gives its logical proof; ver. 24 illustrates it by an example taken from nature. The logical proof rests on an argument *a fortiori:* He who gave the more (the life, the body), will yet more certainly give the less (the nourishment of the life, the clothing of the body). In the example borrowed from nature, it is important to mark how all the figures employed—*sowing, reaping, storehouse, barn*—are connected with the parable of the foolish rich man. All those labours, all those provisions, in the midst of which the rich man died, the ravens know nothing of them; and yet they live! The will of God is thus a surer guarantee of existence than the possession of superabundance. In the Sermon on the Mount, where Matthew has those sayings, they occur apart from any connection with the parable of the foolish rich man, of whom there is no mention whatever. Again, a flower torn from its stalk (see on Luke xi. 5–10). It is certainly not Luke who has cleverly imagined the striking connection between this example and the preceding parable. It must therefore have existed in his sources. But if those sources were the same as those of Matthew, the latter must then have had such gross unskilfulness as to break a connection like this!—In the last words, the adverb μᾶλλον, joined to διαφέρειν, which by itself signifies *to be better*, is a pleonasm having the meaning: to surpass in the highest degree.—In contrast with divine power Jesus sets human powerlessness, as proved by the sudden death of the rich man, which completes the proof of the folly of earthly cares.

Vers. 25–28.[1] *"Which of you, with taking thought, can add*

[1] Ver. 25. ℵ. B. D. It[alliq.] omit ἵνα after πηχυν.— Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L. Q. T. some

to his stature one cubit? 26. *If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why take ye thought for the rest?* 27. *Consider the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.* 28. *If then God so clothe the grass, which is to-day in the field, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; how much more you, O ye of little faith?"* Ver. 25 expresses in a general way the idea of the inefficacy of human cares. *Μεριμνῶν*, participle present: by means of disquieting oneself. *Ἡλικία* might refer to age; we should then require to take *πῆχυς*, *cubit*, in a figurative sense (Ps. xxxix. 6). But the word seems to us to be connected with what is said about the growth of plants, which is sometimes so rapid; it is therefore more natural to give *ἡλικία* its ordinary sense of *stature*. *Πῆχυς*, *cubit*, thus preserves its literal meaning. Plants which give themselves no care, yet make enormous increase, while ye by your anxieties do not in the least hasten your growth. Vers. 25, 26 correspond to ver. 23. Your anxieties will not procure for you an increase of stature; how much less advantages of higher value! The example which follows, taken from nature (ver. 27), corresponds with that of ver. 24. — After reading the delicious piece of M. F. Bovet (*Voyage en Terre-Sainte*, p. 383), it is hard to give up the idea that by the *lily of the fields* we are to understand the beautiful red anemone (*anemone coronaria*) with which the meadows throughout all Palestine are enamelled. Yet Jesus may possibly mean either the magnificent white lily (*lilium candidum*), or the splendid red lily (*lilium rubrum*), which are found, though more rarely, in that country (Winer, *Lexicon*, ad h. v.).—From want of wood, ovens in the East are fed with herbs.

Vers. 29–34.[1] *The Application.*—*"And seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind.* 30. *For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things.*

Mnn., *ουδε* instead of *ουτε*.—Ver. 27. D. Syr^{cur}. has *πως ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει* instead of *πως αυξανει ου κοπια ουδε νηθει*.—Ver. 28. B. D. L. T., *αμφιζει* instead of *αμφιεννυσι*.

[1] Ver. 29. The Mss. are divided between *η τι* (T. R.) and *και τι* (Alex.).—Ver. 31. ℵ. B. D. L. It$^{aliq.}$, *αυτου* instead of *του Θεου* (which is perhaps taken from Matthew).—10 Mjj. 30 Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It$^{aliq.}$ omit *παντα*.

31. *But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you.* 32. *Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.* 33. *Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth.* 34. *For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.*"—With *the cares* which He leaves to the men of this world (vers. 29, 30) Jesus contrasts *the care* which He recommends to His own (vers. 31–34).[1]—*Καί* (ver. 29): and consequently.—*Ὑμεῖς*, *ye*, might contrast men with the lower creatures cited as examples, the ravens, the lilies. But according to ver. 30, this pronoun rather serves to distinguish the disciples from men who have no faith, from the *nations of this world.* Jesus thus designates not only the heathen,—in that case He would have said simply *the nations*,—but also the Jews, who, by refusing to enter into the *βασιλεία*, condemn themselves to become a people *of this world* like the rest, and remain outside of the true people of God, to whom Jesus is here speaking (*the little flock*, ver. 32).

Πλήν (ver. 31): "All this false seeking swept away, *there remains* only one which is worthy of you." "The *kingdom of God*," as always: that state, first internal, then social, in which the human will is nothing but the free agent of the divine will. *All these things*, to wit, food and clothing, shall be given over and above the kingdom which ye seek exclusively, as earthly blessings were given to the young Solomon over and above the wisdom which alone he had asked. *Καί*: and on this single condition. — *Πάντα* was easily omitted after *ταῦτα* by a mistake of sight (confusion of the two *τα*). Bleek acknowledges that this passage is more suitably put in Luke than by Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount, where the entire piece on confidence is only very indirectly connected with the charge of covetousness addressed to the Pharisees.

The expression *little flock*, ver. 32, corresponds with the critical position of the small group of disciples in the midst of undecided or hostile myriads, ver. 1; it recalls the *you, my friends*, ver. 4. Jesus here gives consolation to the believer for times when the interests of the kingdom of God place

[1] Keim, vol. ii. p. 27.

111906

him in a position of earthly privation (Gess). The *a fortiori* argument of ver. 23 is here, ver. 32, reproduced in a higher sphere: "Will not He who has provided with so much love for your eternal well-being, provide more certainly still for your poor earthly maintenance?" What faithful servant would have to disquiet himself about his food in the house of the master for whom he works day and night? And when this master is a Father! It was from experience that Jesus spoke in such a style.

From the duty of being unconcerned about the acquisition of riches, Jesus passes, ver. 33, to that of their wise employment when they are possessed. This precept constitutes, according to De Wette, the great heresy of Luke, or, according to Keim, that of his Ebionite document—salvation by the meritorious virtue of voluntary poverty and almsgiving. But let us first remark, that we have here to do with believers, who as such already possess the kingdom (ver. 32), and do not require to merit it. Then, when Jesus says *sell, give* . . ., is it a commandment? Is it not the sense rather: "Have no fear; only do so!" If you do, you will find it again." Finally, for a member of the society of believers at this period, was not the administration of earthly property a really difficult thing? Was not every disciple more or less in the position of Jesus Himself, who, having once begun His ministry, had required to break off His trade as a carpenter? The giving away of earthly goods is here presented, first as a means of personal emancipation, that the giver might be able to accompany Jesus, and become one of the instruments of His work; then as a gladsome liberality proceeding from love, and fitted to enrich our heaven eternally. In all this there is nothing peculiar to Luke, nor to his alleged Ebionite document. Comp. in respect of the first aspect, the history of the rich young man (in the three Syn.); and, in respect to the second, the word of Jesus in Matthew: "*Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least . . . ye have done it unto me*," and the whole of the judgment scene (Matt. xxv. 31–46).

It must not be forgotten that the kingdom of God at this period was identified with the person of Jesus, and the society of disciples who accompanied Him. To follow Jesus

(literally) in His peregrinations was the only way of possessing this treasure, and of becoming fit to spread it in consequence. Then, as we have seen, it was an army not merely of believers, but of evangelists, that Jesus was now labouring to form. If they had remained attached to the soil of their earthly property, they would have been incapable of following and serving Him without looking backwards (ix. 62). The essential character of such a precept alone is permanent. The form in which Jesus presented it arose from the present condition of the kingdom of God. The mode of fulfilling it varies. There are times when, to disentangle himself and practise Christian love, the believer must give up everything; there are other times when, to secure real freedom and be the better able to give, he must keep and administer. When Paul thus expressed the Christian duty, *possessing as though they possessed not* (1 Cor. vii. 29), it is evident that all he had in view was the disengaged and charitable *spirit* commended by Jesus, and that he modified the transient form which this precept had assumed. There is in the expressions of Jesus a sort of enthusiasm of disdain for those earthly treasures in which the natural man places his happiness: "Get rid of those goods; by giving them away, change them into heavenly treasures, and ye shall have made a good bargain!" This is the *being rich toward God* (ver. 21). Every gift made by human love constitutes in the eyes of God the impersonation of love, a debt payable in heaven. Love regards love with affection, and will find means to requite it.

By this mode of acting, the believer finds that he has a treasure in heaven. Now it is a law of psychology (ver. 34) that the heart follows the treasure; so, your treasure once put in God, your heart will rise unceasingly toward Him. This new attitude of the believer, who lives here below with the eye of his heart turned heavenwards, is what Jesus describes in the sequel. The heart, once set free from its earthly burden, will live on the new attachment to which it is given up, and on the expectation with which it is thus inspired, vers. 35–38.

Vers. 35–38.[1] *The Parable of the Master returning to his*

[1] Ver. 38. Instead of και εαν ελθη εν τη δευτερα φυλακη, και εν τη τριτη φυλακη ελθη, και ευρη ουτως, ℵ. B. L. Tw. X. some Mnn. Syrsch. Italiq. read και εαν εν τη δευτερα

House.—"*Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning;* 36. *And ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately.* 37. *Blessed are those servants whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them.* 38. *And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants.*"—Ver. 35. The long oriental robe requires to be taken up, and the skirt fastened under the girdle, to allow freedom in walking (xvii. 8). If it is night, it is further required that one have a lighted lamp in his hand, to walk quickly and surely to his destination. Those two figures are so thoroughly in keeping with the position of the servant spoken of in the following verses, that we have no doubt about ver. 35 forming part of the parable, vers. 36–38. The faithful believer is described as a servant waiting over night for the arrival of his master, who is returning from a journey. That there may be no delay in opening the door when he shall knock, he keeps himself awake, up and ready to run. The lighted lamp is at his hand; he has even food ready against the time of his return. And it matters not though the return is delayed, delayed even to the morning; he does not yield to fatigue, but persists in his waiting attitude.—Ὑμεῖς, *ye* (ver. 36), your whole person, in opposition to the lighted lamps and girded loins. The word γάμοι, *marriage*, might here have the sense of *banquet*, which it sometimes has (Esth. ii. 18, ix. 22; and perhaps Luke xiv. 8). It is more natural to keep the ordinary sense, only observing that the marriage in question is not that of the master himself, but a friend's, in which he is taking part. What does the master do when received in this way? Moved by such fidelity, instead of seating himself at the table prepared, he causes his devoted servants to seat themselves, and, girding himself as they were girded, he approaches them (παρελθών) to serve them, and

και εν τη τριτη φυλακη ελθη και ευρη ουτως. D. It$^{aliq.}$ Marcion, και εαν ελθη τη εσπερινη φυλακη και ευρησει ουτως ποιησαι (*sic facientes*) και εαν τη δευτερα και τη τριτη.—ℵ^{c}. B. D. L. Syr^{cur}. omit οι δουλοι before εκεινοι; ℵ* It$^{aliq.}$ Ir. omit οι δουλοι εκεινοι.

presents them with the food which they have prepared for him. And the longer delayed his arrival is, the livelier is his gratitude, the greater are the marks of his satisfaction. Among the ancient Jews, the night had only three divisions (Judg. vii. 19); later, probably after the Roman subjugation, four were admitted: from 6 to 9, from 9 to midnight, from midnight to 3, and from 3 to 6 o'clock. If, as cannot be doubted, the master's return represents the Parousia, this parable teaches that that event may be long delayed,—much longer than any one even of the disciples imagined,—and that this delay will be the means of testing their fidelity. The same thought reappears in the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. xxv. 5), "*While the bridegroom tarried;*" and again in that of the talents (xxv. 19), "*After a long time, the lord of those servants cometh.*" Jesus thus proclaimed His return, but not the immediateness of that return.—One hardly dares to apply the promise included in this parable: The Lord in His glory serving him who has faithfully waited for and served Him here below! There is an apparent contradiction of Luke xvii. 7–9. But in the latter passage Jesus is expressing the feeling which should animate the servant: "*I am,* after all that I have done, *but an unprofitable servant.*" Jesus wishes, in opposition to pharisaism, to sweep away the legal idea of merit. Here He is describing the feeling of the master himself; we are in the sphere of love both on the side of the servant and of the master.—The variations of ver. 38 do not affect its general meaning.

The Parousia is a sweet and glorious event to the servants of Jesus (vers. 35–38). But at the same time it is solemn and awful: for He who returns is not only a well-beloved Master, who comes to requite everything which has been given for Him; He is also a thief who takes away everything which should not have been kept.

Vers. 39 and 40.[1] *Parable of the Thief.*—"*And this ye know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through.* 40. *Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye*

[1] Ver. 39. ℵ. D. Syr^cur. It^aliq. omit εγρηγορησεν αν και.—Ver. 40. ℵ. B. L. Q. some Mnn. It. omit ουν after υμεις.

think not."—Γινώσκετε, *ye know*, should be taken as indic. rather than as imper.; this knowledge is the basis of the exhortation, ver. 40. The application should be made as follows: If the hour of attack were known, men would not fail to hold themselves ready *against that hour;* and therefore when it is not known, as in this case, the only way is to be *always* ready.—The real place of this saying is possibly that given to it by Matthew (xxiv. 42–44) in the eschatological discourses; Mark is here at one with him.—Of all the sayings of Jesus, there is not one whose influence has made itself more felt in the writings of the N. T. than this (1 Thess. v. 1, 2; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15); it had awakened a deep echo in the heart of the disciples. It indicates the real meaning of waiting for the second advent of Christ. The Church has not the task of fixing beforehand that unknown and unknowable time; she has nothing else to do, in virtue of her very ignorance, from which she ought not to wish to escape, than to remain invariably on the watch. This attitude is her security, her life, the principle of her virgin purity. This duty of watching evidently embraces both the disengagement and the attachment which are commanded in this discourse.

4th. To the Apostles: vers. 41–53.—Up till now, Jesus had been speaking to all believers; from this point, on occasion of a question put by Peter, He addresses the apostles in particular, and reminds them of the special responsibility which attaches to them in the prospect of their Master's return (vers. 41–48); then He gives vent to the emotions which fill His heart in view of the moral revolution which He is about to work on the earth (vers. 49–53).

Vers. 41–48.[1] *The Parable of the Two Stewards.*—The magnificence of the promise, ver. 37, has struck Peter; he asks himself if such a recompense is intended for all the subjects of the Messiah, or ought not rather to be restricted to those who shall play the chief part in His kingdom. If that is the meaning of his question, ver. 41, it relates not to

[1] Ver. 42. 13 Mjj. several Mnn. read ὁ instead of καὶ before φρόνιμος.—ℵ* T^{w}. It^{plerique}, Vg. read, instead of καταστήσει, κατίστησιν (taken from Matthew).—D. L. Q. X. omit τοῦ before δοῦναι.—Ver. 47. L. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit μηδὲ ποιήσας. ℵ. B. T., η instead of μηδέ.

the parable of the thief (vers. 39, 40), but to that of the Master's return (vers. 35–38), which would confirm the impression that vers. 39 and 40 are an interpolation in this discourse, to be ascribed either to Luke or to the document from which he borrows. The question of Peter recalls one put by the same apostle, Matt. xix. 27, which, so far as the sense goes, is exactly similar.—Jesus continues His teaching as if He took no account (*ἄρα, then*) of Peter's question; but in reality He gives such a turn to the warning which follows about watchfulness, that it includes the precise answer to the question. For a similar form, comp. xix. 25, 26, John xiv. 21–23, *et al.*—All shall be recompensed for their fidelity, but those more magnificently than the rest who have been set to watch over their brethren in the Master's absence (vers. 42–44); as, on the contrary, he who has been in this higher position and neglected his duty, shall be punished much more severely than the servants of a less exalted class (vers. 45–46). Finally, vers. 47, 48, the general principle on which this judgment of the Church proceeds.

Jesus gives an interrogative form to the indirect answer which He makes to Peter's question: "*Who then is the steward . . .?*" Why this style of expression? De Wette thinks that Jesus speaks as if He were seeking with emotion among His own for this devoted servant. Bleek finds again here the form observed, xi. 5–8: "Who is the steward who, if his master comes to find him, shall not be established by him . . .?" Neither of the explanations is very natural. Jesus puts a real question; He invites Peter to seek that steward (it ought to be himself and every apostle). Matthew, by preserving (xxiv. 45–51) the interrogative form, while omitting Peter's question, which gave rise to it, supplies a remarkable testimony to the fidelity of Luke's narrative.—The *stewards*, although slaves (ver. 45), were servants of a higher rank. The *θεραπεία* is the general body of domestics, the *famulitium* of the Latins. This term corresponds to the *all* in Peter's question, as the person of the ruler to the *us* in the same question. The fut. *καταστήσει, shall make*, seems to indicate that the Church shall not be so constituted till after the departure of the Master. *Καιρός*, the *due season*, denotes the time fixed for the weekly or daily distribution;

σιτομέτριον, their rations.—There is a difference between the recompense promised, ver. 44, to the faithful steward and that which was pledged, ver. 37, to the watchful servant. The latter was of a more inward character; it was the expression of the master's personal attachment to the faithful servant who had personally bestowed his care upon him. The former is more glorious; it is a sort of official recompense for services rendered to the house: the matter in question is a high government in the kingdom of glory, in recompense for labours to which the faithful servant has devoted himself in an influential position during the economy of grace. This relation is indicated by the correspondence of the two καταστήσει, vers. 42 and 44.—This saying seems to assume that the apostolate will be perpetuated till the return of Christ; and the figure employed does indisputably prove that there will subsist in the Church to the very end a ministry of the word established by Christ. Of this the apostles were so well aware, that when they were themselves leaving the earth, they took care to establish ministers of the word to fill their places in the Church. This ministry was a continuation, if not of their whole office, at least of one of its most indispensable functions, that of which Jesus speaks in our parable—the regular distribution of spiritual nourishment to the flock; comp. the Pastoral Epistles and 1 Pet. v. The theory which makes the pastorate emanate from the Church as its representative, is therefore not biblical; the office is rather an emanation from the apostolate, and thus mediately an institution of Jesus Himself. Comp. Eph. iv. 11: "*He gave some as . . . pastors and teachers.*" It is Jesus who will have this ministry, who has established it by His mandatories, who procures for His Church in every age those who have a mission to fill it, and who endows them for that end. Hence their weightier responsibility.

Vers. 45, 46 represent an apostle or an unfaithful minister under the image of an unprincipled steward.—The condition of fidelity being the constant watching for the master's return, this servant, to set himself more at his ease in his unfaithfulness, puts the thought of that moment far off. So the minister of Jesus does, who, in place of watching for the Parousia, substitutes the idea of indefinite progress. What will become

of his practical fidelity, since it is the constant watching for the Lord which should be its support? *Beating, eating,* and *drinking* are figures, like the regular and conscientious distribution (ver. 42). The ecclesiastical functionaries described in this piece are those who, instead of dividing the word of Christ to the Church, impose on it their own, who tyrannize over souls instead of tending them, and show themselves so much the more jealous of their rights the more negligently they discharge their duties. *Διχοτομεῖν,* strictly, *to cleave in two,* denotes a punishment which was really used among the nations of antiquity (Egyptians, Chaldeans, Greeks, Romans; comp. also 2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3; Heb. xi. 37). But this literal meaning does not suit here, since we still hear of a position which this servant is to receive,—at least if we do not admit with Bleek that in these last words Jesus passes from the figure to the application. Is it not more natural, even though we cannot cite examples of the usage, to understand the word in the sense of the Latin expression, *flagellis discindere,* to scourge the back with a rod (the: *shall be beaten with many stripes,* ver. 47)?

The portion in question after this terrible punishment is imprisonment, or even the extreme penalty of the law,—the cross, for example, which was always preceded by scourging. The word *ἀπίστων,* "with *the unbelievers,*" might support the explanation given by Bleek; but though the application pierces the veil of the parable, the strict sense is not altogether set aside: "those who cannot be trusted," strangers to the house. Matthew says: *the hypocrites,* false friends (the Pharisees). A faithless apostle will be no better treated than an adversary. —*To have one's portion with* is a Hebraistic and Greek expression, which signifies *to share the lot of* . . .

Vers. 47 and 48. *The Principle.*—"*And that servant which knew his lord's will, and prepared nothing, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes.* 48. *But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.*"—Along with the superiority of position described above, the apostles had received a superior degree of *knowledge;* it is to this new

advantage that ver. 47*a* refers. It is connected with the preceding; for the higher the servant is placed by his master, the fuller are the instructions he receives from him. The same manner of judging will be extended to this other kind of superiority. Ostervald, understanding ἑαυτόν with μὴ ἑτοιμάσας, translates, "who prepared not *himself*." This ellipsis is inadmissible. The meaning is, *who prepared not* [what was necessary to receive his master according to his wishes]. It is the antithesis of vers. 35–37.—The servant whom the master has not initiated so specially into his intentions is nevertheless responsible to a certain extent. For he also has a certain knowledge of his will; comp. the application of this same principle, Rom. ii. 12.—Ver. 48*b*. The general maxim on which the whole of the preceding rests. The two parallel propositions are not wholly synonymous. The passive ἐδόθη, *was given*, simply denotes an assigned position; the *middle* form, παρέθεντο, *men have committed*, indicates that the trust was taken by the master as his own interest; the figure is that of a sum deposited. Consequently the first term is properly applied to the apostolic *commission*, and to the authority with which it is accompanied; the second, to the higher light granted to the apostles.—What is claimed of each is not fruits which do not depend on the labourer, but devotedness to work. Meyer thinks that *the more* signifies "*more* than had been committed to him." It is more natural to understand: *more* than will be exacted from others who have received less.—On the subject of the verbs παρέθεντο and αἰτήσουσιν, see ver. 20.

Mark has preserved (xiii. 37), at the close of the parable of the porter, which he alone has, but which refers to the same duty of watchfulness as the two preceding parables in Luke, this final exhortation: "*What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch.*" This word corresponds in a striking manner to the meaning of Jesus' answer to Peter in Luke: "All should watch, for all shall share in the Master's personal requital (ver. 37); but very specially (περισσότερον, ver. 48) ye, my apostles, who have to expect either a greater recompense or a severer punishment." On this supposition, Luke relates the question of Peter and the indirect answer of Jesus; Mark, a word of Jesus which belonged to His direct answer. How is the relation between the two to be explained? Holtzmann thinks that Luke of himself imagined the question of Peter, founding on this last word of Jesus in Mark. He cannot help confessing, further,

that this interpolation has been very skilfully managed by Luke. Such procedure, in reality, would be as ingenious as arbitrary; it is inadmissible. The account of Luke, besides, finds a confirmation in the text of Matthew, in which the interrogative form of the answer of Jesus is preserved exactly as we find it in Luke, and that though Matthew has omitted Peter's question, which alone explains this form. Weizsäcker supposes inversely that the question of Peter in Luke was borrowed by the latter from the interrogative form of the saying of Jesus in Matt. xxiv. 45: "*Who is then the faithful servant . . . ?*" But Mark's account stands to defend that of Luke against this new accusation. For, as we have seen, the last words of the discourse in Mark had no meaning except in reference to Peter's question reported by Luke. Luke's form cannot be derived from Mark without protest from Matthew, nor from Matthew without Mark in his turn protesting. We have evidently, as it were, the pieces of a wheelwork taken down; each evangelist has faithfully preserved to us those of them which an incomplete tradition had transmitted to him. Applied to a written document, this dividing would form a real mutilation; as the result of a circulating tradition, it admits of easy explanation.

After having thus followed the natural course of the conversation, Jesus returns to the thought from which it had started, the vanity of earthly goods. He shows how this truth directly applies to the present situation (vers. 49–53).

Vers. 49 and 50.[1] *The Character of the immediate Future.* —"*I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I if it be already kindled?* 50. *But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!*"—"Is it a time," said Elisha to the unfaithful Gehazi, "to receive lands and cattle when the hand of God is upon Israel," that is to say, when Shalmaneser is at the gates of Samaria? Is it a time for the believer to give himself up to the peaceable enjoyment of earthly goods when the great struggle is beginning? The Church is about to be born; Israel is about to perish, and the Holy Land to be given over to the Gentiles. Such is the connection, too moving to be expressed by a logical particle, which is implied by the remarkable *asyndeton* between vers. 48 and 49. *Πῦρ βάλλειν*, strictly, *to throw a firebrand.* Jesus feels that His presence is for the earth the brand which is to set everything on fire. "Every fruitful

[1] Ver. 49. Instead of *ἵνα*, which the T. R. reads with 11 Mjj. (Byz.) and the Mnn., 10 Mjj. (Alex.) 40 Mnn. read *ἐστί*.—Ver. 50. The Mss. are divided between *συ* (T. R.) and *σου* (Alex.).

thing," says M. Renan, "is rich in wars." Jesus understood the fruitfulness of His work. The expression *I am come*, which Jesus frequently uses in the Syn., finds its only natural explanation in His lips in the consciousness which He had of His pre-existence. The fire in question here is not the fire of the Holy Spirit, as some of the Fathers thought. The sequel proves that it is the spiritual excitement produced in opposite directions by the coming of Jesus, whence will result the διαμερισμός, *the division*, described from ver. 51 onwards. Two humanities will henceforth be in conflict within the bosom of every nation, under every roof: this thought profoundly moves the heart of the Prince of peace. Hence the broken style of the following words. The εἰ may be taken in the sense of *that*, which it often has, and τί in the sense of *how*: "*How* I wish *that* this fire were already burning!" (Olshausen, De Wette, Bleek.) But this meaning of the two words εἰ and τί, and especially of the second, is not very natural. Accordingly Grotius, Meyer, etc., have been led to admit two propositions,—the one forming a question, the other the answer: "And what will I? Oh that it only were already kindled!" The sense is radically the same. But the second proposition would come too abruptly as an answer to the preceding. Ewald recurs to the idea of a single sentence, only he seeks to give to θέλω a meaning which better justifies the use of εἰ: "And of what *have I to complain* if it be already kindled?" This sense does not differ much from that which appears to us the most natural: "What have I more *to seek*, since it is already kindled?" This saying expresses a mournful satisfaction with the fact that this inevitable rending of humanity is already beginning, as proved by the event recorded vers. 1–12. Jesus submits to bring in war where He wished to establish peace. But it must be; it is His mission: "*I am come to . . .*"

Meantime this fire, which is already kindled, is far yet from bursting into a flame; in order to that there is a condition to be fulfilled, the thought of which weighs heavily on the heart of Jesus: there needs the fact which, by manifesting the deadly antagonism between the world and God, shall produce the division of which Jesus speaks between man and man; there needs the cross. Without the cross, the conflagration

lighted on the earth by the presence of Jesus would very soon be extinguished, and the world would speedily fall back to its undisturbed level; hence ver. 50. The δέ is adversative: "But though the fire is already kindled, it needs, in order that it may blaze forth, that . . ." The baptism in question here is the same as that of which Jesus speaks, Matt. xx. 22 (at least if the expressions analogous to these are authentic in that passage). Jesus certainly makes an allusion to His baptism at the hands of His forerunner, which included a consecration to death. The figure is as follows: Jesus sees Himself about to be plunged into a bath of flame, from which He shall come forth the torch which shall set the whole world on fire.—The Lord expresses with perfect candour the impression of terror which is produced in Him by the necessity of going through this furnace of suffering. Συνέχεσθαι, *to be closely pressed* (straitened), sometimes by the power of love (2 Cor. v. 14); elsewhere, by that of conflicting desires (Phil. i. 23); here, doubtless, by mournful impatience to have done with a painful task. He is under pressure to enter into this suffering, because He is in haste to get out of it. "A prelude of Gethsemane," says Gess in an admirable passage on this discourse.[1] Here, indeed, we have the first crisis of that agony of which we catch a second indication, John xii. 27: "*Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say?*" and which is breathed forth in all its intensity in Gethsemane. Luke alone has preserved to us the memorial of this first revelation of the inmost feelings of Jesus.

After this saying, which is a sort of parenthesis drawn forth by the impression produced on Him by the thought in the preceding verse, He resumes at ver. 51 the development of His declaration, ver. 49.

Vers. 51–53.[2] *The Picture of the Future just declared.*—"*Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, nay; but division. 52. For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against*

[1] Work quoted, p. 79. "We cast ourselves in contemplation into the oppressed soul of Jesus, . . . into His Passion before the Passion" (*ib.*).

[2] Ver. 53. ℵ. B. D. L. T^{tw}. U. some Mnn. Vg., διαμερισθησονται instead of διαμερισθησεται.—Alex. some Mnn., θυγατερα, μητερα, instead of θυγατρι, μητρι.—ℵ. B. D. L. omit αυτης.

three. 53. *The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.*"—Δοκεῖτε, *suppose ye,* is no doubt aimed at the illusion with which the disciples flattered themselves, yet hoping for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom without struggles or sufferings (xix. 11). Jesus does not deny that peace should be the final result of His work; but certainly He denies that it will be its immediate effect.—The simplest solution of the phrase ἀλλ' ἤ is to take it as an abbreviation of οὐχὶ ἄλλο ἤ: "Nothing else than . . ."—Vers. 52 and 53 describe the fire lighted by Jesus. By the preaching of the disciples, the conflagration spreads; with their arrival, it invades every family one after another. But "the fifth commandment itself must give way to a look directed to Him. . . . Undoubtedly it is God who has formed the natural bonds between men; but Jesus introduces a new principle, holier than the bond of nature, to unite men to one another" (Gess, p. 22). —Even Holtzmann observes that the *five* persons indicated, ver. 52, are expressly enumerated, ver. 53: father, son, mother, daughter, daughter-in-law. Matthew (x. 35) has not preserved this delicate touch; are we to think that Luke invented this nice precision, or that Matthew, finding it in the common document, has obliterated it? Two suppositions equally improbable.—Ἐπί indicates hostility, and with more energy in the last two members, where this prep. is construed with the acc.; probably because between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law religious hostility is strengthened by previous natural animosity.

5th. To the Multitudes: vers. 54–59.—After having announced and described the rending, the first symptoms of which He already discerns, Jesus returns anew to the multitude whom He sees plunged in security and impenitence; He points out to those men, so thoroughly earthly and self-satisfied, the thunderbolt which is about to break over their heads, and beseeches them to anticipate the explosion of the divine wrath.

Vers. 54–56.[1] *The Signs of the Times.*—"*And He said also*

[1] Ver. 54. 6 Mjj. (Alex.) some Mnn. omit την.—א. B. L., εκ instead of απο.

to the people, When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is. 55. *And when ye see the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass.* 56. *Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time?*"—Ἔλεγε δὲ καί, *He said also,* is, as we have already seen (i. p. 276), the formula which Luke uses when Jesus at the close of a doctrinal discourse adds a last word of more gravity, which raises the question to its full height, and is intended to leave on the mind of the hearer an impression never to be effaced: "Finally, I have a last word to address to you." This concluding idea is that of the urgency of conversion. Country people, in the matter of weather, plume themselves on being good prophets, and in fact their prognostics do not mislead them: "*Ye say, ye say* . . ., and as ye say, it comes to pass." The rains in Palestine come from the Mediterranean (1 Kings xviii. 44); the south wind, on the contrary, the *simoom* blowing from the desert, brings drought. These people know it; so their calculation is quickly made (εὐθέως); and what is more, it is correct (καὶ γίνεται, twice repeated). So it is, because all this passes in the order of things in which they are interested: they give themselves to discover the future in the present; and as they will, they can. And this clear-sightedness with which man is endowed, they put not forth in the service of a higher interest! A John the Baptist, a Jesus appear, live and die, without their concluding that a solemn hour for them has struck!—This contradiction in their mode of acting is what Jesus designates by the word *hypocrites.* What they want is not the eye, it is the will to use it. The word καιρός, *the propitious time,* is explained by the expression, xix. 44, *the time of thy visitation.* Δοκιμάζειν, *to appreciate the importance.*—Matt. xvi. 1–3 ought not to be regarded as parallel to our passage. The idea is wholly different. Only in Matthew our ver. 56 has been joined with a parable similar to that of Luke in point of form, and that by an association of ideas easily understood.

Vers. 57–59.[1] *The Urgency of Reconciliation to God.*—

—Ver. 56. 6 Mjj. 40 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. put του ουρανου before της γης.—א. B. L. T^tr.^, ουκ οιδατε δοκιμαζειν instead of ου δοκιμαζετε.

[1] Ver. 58. Some Mjj., παραδωσει instead of παραδω (T. R. with 14 Mjj.); βαλει

"Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? 58. *(For) While thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison.* 59. *I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast paid the very last mite."*—A new example (τί δὲ καί) of what they would make haste to do, if their good-will equalled their intelligence. Ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν, *of yourselves;* same meaning as the "at once ye say" (ver. 54). It should be so natural to perform this duty, that it ought not to be necessary to remind them of it. But alas! in the domain of which Jesus is speaking, they are not so quick to draw conclusions as in that wherein they habitually move. Their finger needs to be put on things. Τὸ δικαῖον, *what is just,* denotes the right step to be taken in the given situation, to wit, as the sequel shows, reconciliation to God by conversion.—The following parable (ver. 58) is presented in the form of an exhortation, because the application is blended with the figure. The *for* (ver. 58) has this force: "Why dost not thou act thus with God? *For* it is what thou wouldst not fail to do with a human adversary." We must avoid translating the ὡς ὑπάγεις, "*when* thou goest" (E. V.). Ὡς signifies "*whilst* thou goest;" it is explained by the *in the way* which follows. It is before arriving at the tribunal, while you are on the way thither, that you must get reconciled to him who accuses you. Once before the judge, justice takes its course. The important thing, therefore, is to anticipate that fatal term. Ἐργασίαν δοῦναι seems to be a Latinism, *operam dare.* In the application, God is at once adversary, judge, and officer: the first by His holiness, the second by His justice, the third by His power. Or should we understand by the creditor, God; by the judge, Jesus; by the officers, the angels (Matt. xiii. 41)? Will it ever be possible, relatively to God, to pay the last mite? Jesus does not enter into the question, which lies beyond the horizon of the parable. Other passages seem to prove that in His view this term can never be reached (Mark ix. 42–49). There is in the whole passage, and especially in

or βαλη instead of βαλλη (T. R. with some Mnn.).—Ver. 59. ℵ. B. L., ως instead of ως ου.—5 Mjj., το ισχατον instead of τον ισχατον (14 Mjj.).

the *I tell thee* (ver. 59), the expression of a personal consciousness wholly free from all need of reconciliation.

Matthew places this saying in the Sermon on the Mount (v. 25, 26); he applies it to the duty of reconciliation *between men* as the condition of man's reconciliation to God. It cannot be doubted that this saying, placed there by Matthew in virtue of a simple association of ideas, finds its real context in Luke, in the discourse which is so perfectly linked together.

10. *Conversation on two Events of the Day:* xiii. 1–9.—Luke does not say that the following event took place immediately after the preceding, but only in a general way, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ (ver. 1), in the same circumstances. The three following sayings (vers. 1–3, 4, 5, 6–9) breathe the same engagedness of mind as filled the preceding discourses. The external situation also is the same. Jesus is moving slowly on, taking advantage of every occasion which presents itself to direct the hearts of men to things above.—The *necessity* of conversion is that of which Jesus here reminds His hearers; in xii. 54 et seq. He had rather preached its *urgency.*

1*st.* Vers. 1–3.[1] *The Galilæans massacred by Pilate.*—Josephus does not mention the event to which the following words relate. The Galileans were somewhat restless; conflicts with the Roman garrison easily arose. In the expression, *mingling their blood with that of the sacrifice,* there is a certain poetical emphasis which often characterizes popular accounts. —The impf. παρῆσαν signifies "they were there relating." Jesus with His piercing eye immediately discerns the prophetical significance of the fact. The carnage due to Pilate's sword is only the prelude to that which will soon be carried out by the Roman army throughout all the Holy Land, and especially in the temple, the last asylum of the nation. Was not all that remained of the Galilean people actually assembled forty years later in the temple, expiating their national impenitence under the stroke of Titus? The word *likewise* (ver. 3) may therefore be taken literally. A serious, in-

[1] Ver. 2. ℵ. B. D. L., ταυτα instead of τοιαυτα.—Ver. 3. The Mss. are divided between ωσαυτως (T. R., Byz.) and ομοιως (Alex.).—A. D. M. X. Γ. and several Mnn., μετανοησητε instead of μετανοητε.

dividual, and national conversion at the call of Jesus. could alone have prevented that catastrophe.

2*d.* Vers. 4, 5.[1] *The Persons buried by the Tower of Siloam.*—The disaster which has been related recalls another to His mind, which He mentions spontaneously, and which He applies specially to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The aqueduct and pool of Siloam are situated where the valley of Tyropeon, between Sion and Moriah, opens into that of Jehoshaphat.—Forty years later, the fall of the houses of the burning capital justified this warning not less strikingly.—When a disaster comes upon an individual, there is a disposition among men to seek the cause of it in some special guiltiness attaching to the victim. Jesus turns his hearers back to human guilt in general, and their own in particular; and from that, which to the pharisaic heart is an occasion of proud confidence, He derives a motive to humiliation and conversion, an example of what was called, xii. 57, *judging what is right.*

3*d.* Vers. 6–9.[2] *The Time of Grace.*—Here again we have the formula ἔλεγε δέ, which announces the true and final word on the situation. (See at xii. 54.)—A vineyard forms an excellent soil for fruit trees. As usually, the fig-tree represents Israel. God is the owner, Jesus the vine-dresser who intercedes.—*Ἱνατί (γένηται), To what end? Καί, moreover;* not only is it useless itself, but it also renders the ground useless. Bengel, Wieseler, Weizsäcker find an allusion in the *three years* to the period of the ministry of Jesus which was already past, and so draw from this parable chronological conclusions. Altogether without reason; for such details ought to be explained by their relation to the general figure of the parable of which they form a part, and not by circumstances wholly foreign to the description. In the figure chosen by Jesus, three years are the time of a *full* trial, at the end of which the inference of incurable sterility may be drawn. Those three years, therefore, represent the time of

[1] Ver. 4. The Mss. are divided between οὗτοι (T. R.) and αὐτοὶ (Alex.). Ἐν before Ἰερουσαλήμ is omitted by B. D. L. Z.—Ver. 5. The Mss. are divided between ὁμοίως and ὡσαύτως; between μετανοῆτε and μετανοήσητε.

[2] Ver. 7. ℵ. B. D. L. T^{w}. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It. Vg. add ἀφ' οὗ after τρία ἔτη. —Ver. 9. ℵ. B. L. T^{w}. 2 Mnn. place εἰς τὸ μέλλον before εἰ δὲ μήγε.

grace granted to Israel; and the last year, added at the request of the gardener, the forty years' respite between the Friday of the crucifixion and the destruction of Jerusalem, which were owing to that prayer of Jesus: "*Father, forgive them.*"—The MSS. have the two forms *κόπρια*, from *κόπριον*, and *κοπρίαν*, from *κοπρία*. The proposition *κἂν μέν . . .* is elliptical, as often in classical Greek; we must understand *καλῶς ἔχει*. The Alex., by placing *εἰς τὸ μέλλον* before *εἰ δὲ μήγε*, probably wished to escape this ellipsis: "If it bear fruit, let it for the future [live]." The extraordinary pains of the gardener bestowed on this sickly tree represent the marvels of love which Jesus shall display in His death and resurrection, then at Pentecost and by means of the apostolic preaching, in order to rescue the people from their impenitence. This parable gives Israel to know that its life is only a respite, and that this respite is nearing its end. Perhaps Paul makes an allusion to this saying when he admonishes Gentile Christians, the branches of the wild olive, saying to them, *ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ* (Rom. xi. 22).

Holtzmann acknowledges the historical truth of the introduction, ver. 1. He ascribes it to the *Logia*, like everything which he finds true in the introductions of Luke. But if this piece was in Λ., of which Matthew made use, how has he omitted it altogether?

11. *The Progress of the Kingdom:* xiii. 10–21.—During this journey, as throughout His whole ministry, Jesus did not fail to frequent the synagogues on the Sabbath days. The present narrative introduces us to one of those scenes. Perhaps the feeling which led Luke to place it here, was that of the contrast between Israel, which was hasting to destruction, and the Church, which was already growing.—A glorious deed, which tells strongly on the multitude (vers. 10–17), leads Jesus to describe in two parables the power of the kingdom of God (vers. 18–21).

1*st.* Vers. 10–17.[1] *The Healing of the palsied Woman.*—And first the miracle, vers. 10–13. This woman was completely

[1] Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. T^{tr}. X. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit *ην* after *γυνη*.—Ver. 14. The Mss. are divided between *εν ταυταις* (T. R.) and *εν αυταις* (Alex.).—Ver. 15. Some Mjj. and Mnn. Syr., *ο Ιησους* instead of *ο κυριος*.—17 Mjj. 80 Mnn. It. Vg., *υποκριται* instead of *υποκριτα*, which the T. R. reads with D. V. X. the most of the Mnn. Syr.

bent, and her condition was connected with a psychical weakness, which in turn arose from a higher cause, by which the will of the sufferer was bound. This state of things is described by the phrase: *a spirit of infirmity.* Jesus first of all heals the psychical malady: *Thou art loosed.* Ἀέλυσθαι, the perfect: it is an accomplished fact. The will of the sufferer through faith draws from this declaration the strength which it lacked. At the same time, by the laying on of His hands, Jesus restores the bodily organism to the control of the emancipated will; and the cure is complete.

The conversation, vers. 14–17. It was the Sabbath. The ruler of the synagogue imagines that he should apply to Jesus the Rabbinical regulation for practising physicians. Only, not daring to attack Him, he addresses his discourse to the people (ver. 14). Θεραπεύεσθε, come to get yourselves healed.—Jesus takes up the challenge. The plural *hypocrites* is certainly the true reading (comp. the plural *adversaries,* ver. 17). Jesus puts on trial the whole party of whom this man is the representative. The severity of His apostrophe is justified by the comparison which follows (vers. 15 and 16) between the freedom which they take with the Sabbath law, when their own interests, even the most trivial, are involved, and the extreme rigour with which they apply it, when the question relates to their neighbour's interests, even the gravest, as well as to their estimate of the conduct of Jesus. The three contrasts between *ox* (or *ass*) and *daughter of Abraham,* between *stall* and *Satan,* and between the two bonds, material and spiritual, to be unloosed, are obvious at a glance. The last touch: *eighteen years,* in which the profoundest pity is expressed, admirably closes the answer.

Holtzmann thinks that what has led Luke to place this account here, is the connection between the eighteen years' infirmity (ver. 11) and the three years' sterility (ver. 7)! Not content with ascribing to Luke this first puerility, he imputes to him a second still greater: that which has led Luke to place at ver. 18 the parable of the grain of mustard seed, is that it is borrowed from the vegetable kingdom, like that of the fig-tree (vers. 7–9)!!

This so nervous reply brings the admiration of the people to a height, and shuts the mouth of His adversaries. Jesus then, rising to the general idea, of which this deed is only a particular application, to wit, the *power* of the kingdom of

God, developes it in two parables fitted to present this truth in its two chief aspects; the two are, the *mustard seed* (vers. 18, 19) and the *leaven* (vers. 20, 21).

2*d*. Vers. 18–21. *The Two Parables.*—The kingdom of God has two kinds of power: the power of *extension*, by which it gradually embraces all nations; the power of *transformation*, by which it gradually regenerates the whole of human life. The natural symbol of the first is a seed which acquires in a short time an increase out of all proportion to its original smallness; that of the second, a fermenting element, materially very inconsiderable, but capable of exercising its assimilating virtue over a large mass. Those two parables form part of the collection, Matt. xiii. 31 et seq.; the first only is found Mark iv. 30, 31.

Vers. 18 and 19.[1] Again the formula ἔλεγε δέ (or οὖν, as some Alex. read).—The two questions of ver. 18 express the activity of mind which seeks in nature the analogies which it needs. The first: "To what *is* like . . .," affirms the existence of the emblem sought; the second: "To what shall I liken . . .," has the discovery of it in view. Mark likewise introduces this parable with two questions; but they differ both in substance and form from those of Luke. Tradition had indeed preserved the memory of this style of speaking; only it had modified the tenor of the questions. We must certainly reject with the Alex., in the text both of Luke and Matthew, the epithet *great* applied to *tree*. Jesus does not mean to contrast a great tree with a small one, but a tree to vegetables in general. The mustard plant in the East does not rise beyond the height of one of our small fruit trees. But the exceptional thing is, that a plant like mustard, which belongs to the class of garden herbs, and the grain of which is exceedingly small, puts forth a woody stalk adorned with branches, and becomes a *veritable tree*. It is thus the striking type of the disproportion which prevails between the smallness of the kingdom of God at its commencement, when it is yet enclosed in the person of Jesus, and its final expansion, when it shall embrace all peoples. The form of the parable is shorter and simpler in Luke than in the other two.

[1] Ver. 18. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., οὖν instead of δέ after ἔλεγεν.—Ver. 19. ℵ. B. D. L. T^{w}. Syr^{cur}. It$^{aliq.}$ omit μέγα after δένδρον.

Vers. 20 and 21.[1] Jesus anew seeks an image (ver. 20) to portray the power of the kingdom of God as a principle of moral transformation. There is here, as in all the pairs of parables, a second aspect of the same truth; comp. v. 36–38, xv. 3–10, Matt. xiii. 44–46, John x. 1–10. We even find in Luke xv. and John x. a third parable completing the other two. Leaven is the emblem of every moral principle, good or bad, possessing in some degree a power of fermentation and assimilation; comp. Gal. v. 9.—The *three measures* should be explained, like the *three years* (ver. 7), by the figure taken as a whole. It was the quantity ordinarily employed for a batch. They have been understood as denoting the three branches of the human race, Shemites, Japhethites, and Hamites; or, indeed, Greeks, Jews, and Samaritans (Theod. of Mopsuestia); or, again, of the heart, soul, and spirit (Augustine). Such reveries are now unthought of. The idea is, that the spiritual life enclosed in the gospel must penetrate the *whole* of human life, the individual, thereby the family, and through the latter, society.

Those two parables form the most entire contrast to the picture which the Jewish imagination had formed of the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. One wave of the magic wand was to accomplish everything in the twinkling of an eye. In opposition to this superficial notion, Jesus sets the idea of a moral development which works by spiritual means and takes account of human freedom, consequently slow and progressive. How can it be maintained, in view of such sayings, that He believed in the immediate nearness of His return?—The place which those two parables occupy in the great collection Matt. xiii., is evidently the result of a systematic arrangement; there they have the effect of two flowers in a herbarium. Luke has restored them to their natural situation. His account is at once independent of and superior to that of Matthew; Mark accords with Matthew.

[1] Ver. 20. The Alex. It. Vg. add καὶ before πάλιν.—Ver. 21. The Mss. are divided between ἐνέκρυψεν (T. R.) and ἔκρυψεν (Alex.).

SECOND CYCLE.—XIII. 22–XVII. 10.

A new Series of Incidents in the Journey.

Ver. 22 serves as an introduction to this whole cycle. Jesus slowly continues His journey of evangelization (διεπορεύετο, *He proceeded through* the country), stopping at every city, and even at every village (κατά, distributive), taking advantage of every occasion which presents itself to instruct both those who accompany Him and the people of the place, only pursuing in the main a general direction toward Jerusalem (διδάσκων, ποιούμενος). Nothing could be more natural than this remark, which is founded on the general introduction, ix. 51, and in keeping with the analogous forms used in cases of summing up and transition, which we have observed throughout this Gospel.

1. *The Rejection of Israel, and the Admission of the Gentiles:* xiii. 23–30. An unforeseen question calls forth a new flash. It was probably evoked by a saying of Jesus, which appeared opposed to the privileges of Israel, that is to say, to its *national* participation in the Messianic blessedness.

Vers. 23–27.[1] "*Then one said unto Him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And He said unto them,* 24. *Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able.* 25. *When once the Master of the house is risen up, and shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us, and He shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are:* 26. *Then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in Thy presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets.* 27. *But He shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity.*"—The question of ver. 23 was to a certain extent a matter of curiosity. In such cases Jesus immediately gives a practical turn to His answer. Comp. xii. 41, John iii. 3; and hence Luke says (ver. 23): "He said *to them.*" Jesus gives no direct answer to the man; He addresses a warning to the people on

[1] Ver. 24. ℵ. B. D. L. 2 Mnn. It$^{\text{alliq.}}$, θύρας instead of πύλης.—Ver. 25. ℵ. B. L. It$^{\text{alliq.}}$ Vg. read κύριε only once.—Ver. 26. The Mss., ἀρξεσθε or ἀρξησθε.—Ver. 27. B. T$^{\text{w.}}$, λέγων instead of λέγω. ℵ. Vss. omit this word.—B. L. R. T$^{\text{w.}}$ omit ὑμᾶς.

the occasion of his question.—The Messianic kingdom is represented under the figure of a palace, into which men do not enter, as might appear natural, by a magnificent portal, but by a narrow gate, low, and scarcely visible, a mere postern. Those invited refuse to pass in thereby; then it is closed, and they in vain supplicate the master of the house to re-open it; it remains closed, and they are, and continue, excluded. The application is blended, to a certain extent, as in xii. 58, 59, with the figure. Ἀγωνίζεσθαι, *to strive,* refers in the parable to the difficulty of passing through the narrow opening; in the application, to the humiliations of penitence, the struggles of conversion. The *strait gate* represents attachment to the lowly Messiah; the magnificent gateway by which the Jews would have wished to enter, would represent, if it were mentioned, the appearance of the glorious Messiah whom they expected. *I declare unto you,* says Jesus: They will think it incredible that so great a number of Jews, with the ardent desire to have part in that kingdom, should not succeed in entering it. The word πολλοί, *many,* proves the connection between this discourse and the question of ver. 23. Only Jesus does not say whether there will be few or many saved; He confines Himself to saying that there will be many lost. This is the one important matter for practical and individual application. It is perfectly consistent with this truth that there should be many saved. The meaning of the expression, *will seek to enter in,* ver. 24, is explained at ver. 25 by the cries which are uttered, and the knockings at the gate; and the meaning of the words, *but shall not be able,* ver. 24, is explained by vers. 26 and 27, which describe the futility of those efforts.

It is not possible to connect the ἀφ' οὗ, *when once,* with the preceding phrase; the period would drag intolerably. The principal proposition on which this conjunction depends must therefore be sought in what follows. This might be καὶ ἄρξεσθε (not ἄρξησθε), ver. 25*b*: "When once the Master has risen . . . ye shall begin, *on your side* (καί), . . .;" or καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ at the end of the same ver. 25: "He, *on His side* (καί), shall answer and say . . .;" or, finally, and most naturally of all, the apodosis may be placed, as we have put it in our translation, at ver. 26, in the words: τότε ἄρξεσθε:

then ye shall begin. The word *then* favours this construction. The decisive act of the Master in rising from His seat to shut the door symbolizes the fact that conversion and pardon are no longer possible (*ἀφ' οὗ, when once*). What moment is this? Is it that of the rejection and dispersion of Israel? No; for the Jews did not then begin to cry and to knock according to the description of ver. 25. Is it the time of the Parousia, when the great Messianic festival shall open? No; for the Jews then living shall be converted and received into the palace. The words, *when ye shall see* (ver. 28), strikingly recall a similar feature in the parable of the wicked rich man, —that in which this unhappy one is represented in Hades contemplating from afar the happiness of Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. We are thereby led to apply what follows ("when ye shall see Abraham . . .," ver. 23) to the judgment which Jesus pronounces at present on the unbelieving Jews, excluding them in the life to come from all participation in the blessings of salvation. Gess: "The house where Jesus waits can be no other than heaven; it is the souls of the dead who remind Him, ver. 26, of the relations which He had with them on the earth."—This ver. 26 indicates the tendency to rest salvation on certain external religious advantages: "Thou wast one of ourselves; we cannot perish." Is there in the words, *I know not whence ye are* (ver. 27), an allusion to the false confidence which the Jews put in their natural descent from Abraham?

Vers. 28–30.[1] "*There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.* 29. *And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God.* 30. *And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last.*"—Wailings express despair, gnashings of teeth rage. The souls of the condemned oscillate between those two feelings. The article before the two substantives has the force of setting aside all former similar impressions as comparatively insignificant. Messianic blessedness is represented in ver. 28, according to

[1] Ver. 28. Marcion substituted for the enumeration, ver. 28: πάντας τοὺς δικαίους, and omitted vers. 29 and 30.

a figure familiar among the Jews (xiv. 15), under the image of a banquet presided over by the patriarchs. From ver. 29 it follows that the believing Gentiles are admitted as well as the faithful posterity of Abraham. Thus there are really many persons saved.—The words *and behold* (ver. 30) refer to the surprise produced by this entire reversal of position. The *last* here are not those who, within the confines of the kingdom, occupy the last place; they are, as the context proves, those who are excluded from it; they are in the last place, absolutely speaking. The first are all the saved. The first proposition evidently applies to the Gentiles who are admitted (ver. 29), the second to the Jews who are rejected (vers. 27 and 28).

Sayings similar to those of vers. 25–27 are found in Matt. vii., at the end of the Sermon on the Mount, also in xxv. 10–12 and 30. There is nothing to prevent us from regarding them as uttered on a different occasion. Those of ver. 28 and 29 appear in Matt. viii. 11, 12, immediately after the cure of the centurion's son. But they are not so well accounted for there as in the context of Luke. The apophthegm of ver. 30 forms (Matt. xix. 30 and xx. 16) the preface and the conclusion of the parable of the labourers called at different hours. In this context, *the last* who become *the first* are manifestly the labourers who, having come later, find themselves privileged to receive the same hire; *the first* who become *the last* are those who, having wrought from the beginning of the day, are thereby treated less advantageously. Is this sense natural? Is not the application of those expressions in Luke to the rejected Jews and admitted Gentiles more simple?—The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans are the only true commentary on this piece, and on the sayings of vers. 28 and 29 in particular. Now, as the historical truth of the whole passage is certified by the parallel of Matthew, we have a clear proof that the gospel of Paul no way differed in substance from that of Jesus and the Twelve.

2. *The Farewell to the Theocracy:* xiii. 31–35.—When the heart is full of some one feeling, everything which tells upon it from without calls forth the expression of it. And so, at the time when the mind of Jesus is specially occupied about the future of His people, it is not surprising that this feeling

comes to light with every circumstance which supervenes. There is therefore no reason why this perfectly natural fact should be taken to prove a systematic arrangement originating with Luke.

Vers. 31–33.[1] "*The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto Him, Get thee out, and depart hence; for Herod will kill thee.* 32. *And He said unto them, Go ye and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected.* 33. *Nevertheless, I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.*"—We cannot help being surprised at seeing the Pharisees interesting themselves in the safety of Jesus, and we are naturally led to suspect a feint, if not a secret understanding with Herod. Already at a much earlier date Mark (iii. 6) had showed us the Herodians and Pharisees plotting together. Is not something of the same kind now repeated? Herod, on whose conscience there already weighed the murder of a prophet, was not anxious to commit another crime of the same sort; but no more did he wish to see this public activity of Jesus, of which his dominions had been for some time the theatre, and the popular excitement which accompanied it, indefinitely prolonged. As to the Pharisees, it was natural that they should seek to draw Jesus to Judea, where He would fall more directly under the power of the Sanhedrim. It had been agreed, therefore, to bring this lengthened journey to an end by terrifying Jesus. He penetrates their intrigue; and hence He addresses His reply to Herod himself, making the Pharisees at the same time His message-bearers, as they had been the king's message-bearers to Him. "I see well on whose part you come. Go and answer Herod . . ." Thus also the epithet *fox*, which He applies to this prince, finds its explanation. Instead of issuing a command, as becomes a king, he degrades himself to play the part of an intriguer. Not daring to show the teeth of the lion, he uses the tricks of the fox. Fault has been found with Jesus for speaking with so little respect of the prince of His people. But it

[1] Ver. 31. 7 Mjj. (Alex.) 15 Mnn., ωρα instead of ημερα.—Ver. 32. ℵ. B. L. 2 Mnn., αποστελω instead of επιστελω.—B. some Mnn. Vss. add ημερα after τριτη.—Ver. 33. ℵ. D. Δ. some Mnn., ερχομενη instead of εχομενη.

must be remembered that Herod was the creature of Cæsar, and not the lawful heir of David's throne.

The meaning of the first part of the answer (ver. 32*b*) is this: "Reassure thyself, thou who seekest to terrify me; my present activity in no way threatens thy power; I am not a Messiah such as he whose appearance thou dreadest; some devils cast out, some cures accomplished, such is all my work in thy dominions. And to complete the assuring of thee, I promise thee that it shall not be long: to-day, to-morrow, and a day more; then it will be at an end." These last words symbolically express the idea of a very short time; comp. Hos. vi. 2. We may regard τελειοῦμαι either, with Bleek, as Attic fut. mid., or, what seems simpler, as a pres. mid. used for the fut. to designate what is immediately imminent. The term so near can be none other than that of His life; comp. 33*b*. Bleek and others give τελειοῦμαι the active meaning: "*I close* [my ministry in Galilee]." But the word τελειοῦμαι in this context is too solemn to suit this almost superfluous sense.—The Alex. reading ἀποτελῶ, *I finish*, does not so well correspond to the parallel term ἐκβάλλω, *I cast out*, as the received reading ἐπιτελῶ, *I work*. It is probably owing to a retrospective influence of the word τελειοῦμαι.

Ver. 33. Short as the time is which is allowed to Jesus, it remains none the less true (πλήν) that He will quietly pursue His present journey, and that no one will force Him to bring His progress and work hastily to an end. The δεῖ, *I must*, which refers to the decree of Heaven, justifies this mode of acting. Πορεύεσθαι, *to travel*, the emblem of life and action; this word is opposed to τελειοῦμαι, which designates the time at which the journeying ends. Τῇ ἐχομένῃ (*the day following*), ver. 33, corresponds to τῇ τρίτῃ (*the third day*), ver. 32; Jesus means: "I have only three days; but *I have them*, and no one will cut them short." Wieseler takes the three days literally, and thinks that at the time when Jesus thus spoke He was but three days' journey from Bethany, whither He was repairing. It would be difficult to reduce so weighty a saying to greater poverty of meaning. Bleek, who does not succeed in overcoming the difficulty of this enigmatical utterance, proposes to suppress in ver. 33 the words σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καί as a very old interpolation. No document supports

this supposition, which would have the effect of mutilating one of the most striking declarations of our Lord.

The last words of ver. 33 are the answer of Jesus to the Pharisees. They, too, may reassure themselves; their prey will not escape them. Jerusalem has the monopoly of killing the prophets, and on this highest occasion the city will not be deprived of its right. The word ἐνδέχεται, *it is possible*, contains, like the entire saying, a scathing irony: "*It is not suitable;* it would be contrary to use and wont, and, in a manner, to theocratic decorum, if such a prophet as I should perish elsewhere than in Jerusalem!" No doubt John the Baptist had perished away from that city. But such ironies must not be taken in the strict letter. Jerusalem could not let her privilege be twice taken from her in so short a time! The relation indicated by ὅτι, *for*, is this: "I know that the time which is at my disposal in favour of Galilee will not be cut short by my death; for I am not to die elsewhere than at Jerusalem . . ."—According to Holtzmann, this passage, peculiar to Luke and taken from *A*, was omitted by Matthew because of its obscurity. Must he not have omitted many others for the same reason?

Already, vers. 4, 5, on occasion of an event which more particularly concerned the Galileans, the mind of Jesus had been directed toward Jerusalem. Now the thought of this capital become, as it were, the executioner of the prophets, takes possession of His heart. His grief breaks forth; the prelude to the tears of Palm-day.

Vers. 34 and 35.[1] "*O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!* 35. *Behold, your house is left unto you. But I say unto you, ye shall not see me until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord.*"—It is surprising, at first sight, to find such an apostrophe to Jerusalem in the heart of

[1] Ver. 34. The Mss. are divided between την νοσσιαν (Alex. and T. R.) and τα νοσσια (Byz. Syr. It^{plerique}).—Ver. 35. T. R. adds ερημος after οικος υμων, with D. E. G. H. M. U. X. Δ. the most of the Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}.—All the Mjj., λεγω δε (N. L. without δε) instead of αμην δε λεγω, which T. R. reads with several Mnn.—6 Mjj. omit οτι.—The Mss. are divided between ως (or ως αν) ηξη (or ηξει) οτε ειπητε (T. R.) and ως (or ως αν) ειπητε (Alex., according to Matthew).

Galilee. But were not the Pharisees whom Jesus had before Him the representatives of that capital? Comp. v. 17: "There were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judea, *and Jerusalem.*" Had He not been setting their minds at rest as such? Such an apostrophe to Jerusalem, regarded from a distance, has something about it more touching than if He had already been within its walls. In Matt. xxiii. 37 it is placed, during His sojourn at Jerusalem, on one of the days preceding the Passion, and at the point when Jesus leaves the temple for the last time. This situation is grand and tragic; but is it not probable that this placing of the passage was due to the certainly too narrow application (see below) of the expression *your house* (ver. 35) to the temple? —The words *thy children* have been applied by Baur not to the inhabitants of Jerusalem only, but to all Israelites, Galileans included; and he denies, consequently, that this saying could serve to prove the conclusion which has often been drawn from it, viz. that the narrative of the Syn. implies the numerous sojourns at Jerusalem which are related by John. But the relation of ver. 34 to the latter part of ver. 33 compels us to restrict the meaning of the word to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; its only admissible sense also in Luke xix. 44; and, taken by itself, its only natural sense. Only, it is assumed that the fate of the population of the capital involves in it that of the other inhabitants of the country.

The contrast between *I would . . .* and *ye would not*, proves the sad privilege which man possesses of resisting the most earnest drawings of grace. As to Jesus, while mournfully asserting the futility of His efforts to save His people, He does not the less persevere in His work; for He knows that, if it has not the result that it might and should have, it will have another, in which God will notwithstanding carry out His plan to fulfilment. Some Jews saved shall become, in default of the nation as a whole, the instruments of the world's salvation.—Jesus represents Himself, ver. 34, as a protector stretching His compassionate arms over the theocracy and its capital, because He knows well that He alone can rescue them from the catastrophe by which they are

threatened. It is, in another form, the idea of the parable of the fig-tree (vers. 6–9). Now Israel rejects the protection which He offers. What more can Jesus do (ver. 35)? Leave to Israel the care of its own defence, that is to say,—Jesus knows it well,—give it up to a ruin which He alone could avert. Such is the meaning of the words, *your house is left unto you;* henceforth it is given over to your guardianship. Jesus frees Himself of the charge which His Father had confided to Him, the salvation of the theocracy. It is in its every feature the situation of the divine Shepherd in His last endeavour to save the flock of slaughter, Zach. xi. 4–14. The application of the expression *your house* to the temple, in such a unity, must be felt to be much too special. The place in question is Canaan, the abode divinely granted to the people, and especially Jerusalem, the centre of the theocracy. The authenticity of the word ἔρημος, *desolate* (ver. 35), appears more than doubtful both in Matthew and Luke. If this word were authentic, it would refer to the withdrawal of Jesus' visible presence; comp. Ezek. xi., where the cloud rising from over the sanctuary passes eastward, and from that moment the temple is empty and *desolate.* But the government ὑμῖν, "is left to *you*," and the want of sufficient authorities, speak against this reading.

Like a bird of prey hovering in the air, the enemy is threatening the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Jesus, who was sheltering them under His wings as a hen her brood, withdraws, and they remain exposed, reduced thenceforth to defend themselves. The adversative form, *but I say unto you,* is certainly preferable to that of Matthew, *for I say unto you.* "I go away; *but I declare to you,* it will be for longer than you think; that my absence may be brought to an end, you yourselves, by the change of your sentiments in regard to me, will have to give the signal for my return." The words ἕως ἂν ἥξῃ, *until it come to pass that . . .*, are the true reading. This moral change will certainly (ἕως) come about, but when (ἄν) it is impossible to say. Some commentators (Paulus, Wieseler, etc.) think that the time here pointed to is Palm-day, on which Jesus received the homage of part of the people, and particularly of the Galileans, to whom these sayings had been addressed. "Ye shall not see me again, ye

Galileans, until we meet together on the occasion of my entry into Jerusalem." But how poor and insignificant would this meaning be, after the previous sayings! What bearing on the salvation of Israel had this separation of a few weeks? Besides, it was not to the Galileans that Jesus was speaking; it was to the representatives of the pharisaic party (vers. 31–34). In Matthew's context, the interpretation of Wieseler is still more manifestly excluded.—The words which Jesus here puts into the mouth of converted Israel in the end of the days, are taken from Ps. cxviii. 26. This cry of penitent Israel will bring the Messiah down again, as the sigh of Israel, humbled and waiting for consolation, had led Him to appear the first time (Isa. lxiv. 1). The announcement of the future return of Jesus, brought about by the faith of the people in His Messiahship (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), thus forms the counterpart to that of His near departure, caused by the national unbelief (τελειοῦμαι).—How can any one fail to feel the appropriateness, the connection, the harmony of all the parts of this admirable answer? How palpable, at least in this case, is the decisive value of Luke's short introduction for the understanding of the whole piece! The important matter here, as everywhere, is, above all, the precise indication of the interlocutors: "The same day there came *certain of the Pharisees*, saying . . ."

3. *Jesus at a Feast:* xiv. 1–24.—The following piece allows us to follow Jesus in His domestic life and familiar conversations. It is connected with the preceding by the fact that it is with a Pharisee Jesus has to do. We are admitted to the entire scene: 1*st.* The entering into the house (vers. 1–6); 2*d.* The sitting down at table (vers. 7–11); 3*d.* Jesus conversing with His host about the choice of his guests (vers. 12–14); 4*th.* His relating the parable of the great supper, occasioned by the exclamation of one of the guests (vers. 15–24).

Holtzmann, of course, regards this frame as being to a large extent invented by Luke to receive the detached sayings of Jesus, which he found placed side by side in A. This is to suppose in Luke as much genius as unscrupulousness. Weizsäcker, starting from the idea that the contents of this part are systematically arranged and frequently altered to meet the practical questions which were agitating the apostolic Church at the date of Luke's composition,

alleges that the whole of this chapter relates to the *agapæ* of the primitive Church, and is intended to describe those feasts as embodiments of brotherly love and pledges of the heavenly feast; and he concludes therefrom, as from an established fact, the somewhat late origin of our Gospel. Where is the least trace of such an intention to be found?

1*st.* Vers. 1-6.[1]—To accept an invitation to the house of a Pharisee, after the previous scenes, was to do an act at once of courage and kindness. The host was one of the *chief* of his sect. There is no proof of the existence of a hierarchy in this party; but one would naturally be formed by superiority of knowledge and talent. The interpretation of Grotius, who takes *τῶν Φαρισαίων* as in apposition to *τῶν ἀρχόντων*, is inadmissible. The guests, it is said, watched Jesus. Ver. 2 indicates the trap which had been laid for Him; and *ἰδού, behold,* marks the time when this unlooked-for snare is discovered to the eyes of Jesus. The picture is taken at the moment. The word *ἀποκριθείς, answering* (ver. 3), alludes to the question implicitly contained in the sick man's presence: "Wilt thou heal, or wilt thou not heal?" Jesus replies by a counter question, as at vi. 9. The silence of His adversaries betrays their bad faith. The reading *ὄνος, ass,* in the *Sinaiticus* and some MSS. (ver. 5), arises no doubt from the connection with *βοῦς, ox,* or from the similar saying, xiii. 15. The true reading is *υἱός, son:* "If thy son, or even thine ox only . . ." In this word *son,* as in the expression *daughter of Abraham* (xiii. 16), there is revealed a deep feeling of tenderness for the sufferer. We cannot overlook a correspondence between the malady (dropsy) and the supposed accident (falling into a pit). Comp. xiii. 15, 16, the correspondence between the halter with which the ox is fastened to the stall, and the bond by which Satan holds the sufferer in subjection. Here again we find the perfect suitableness, even in the external drapery, which characterizes the declarations of our Lord. In Matt. xii. 11 this figure is applied to the curing

[1] Ver. 3. ℵ. B. D. L. omit *τι* before *ἔξεστιν*, and, with several Mnn. and Vss., they add *η ου* after *θεραπευσαι* (T. R., *θεραπευειν*).—Ver. 5. 6 Mjj. 15 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit *αποκριθεις* before *προς αυτους*.—A. B. E. G. H. M. S. U. V. Γ. Δ. Λ. 130 Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ read *υιος* instead of *ονος*, which ℵ. K. L. X. Π. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg. read.—The Mss. are divided between *εμπεσειται* (T. R.) and *πεσειται* (Alex.).—Ver. 6. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. omit *αυτω* after *ανταποκριθηναι*.

of a man who has a withered hand. It is less happy, and is certainly inexact.

2*d.* Vers. 7–11.[1]—Here is the point at which the guests seat themselves at table. The recommendation contained in this passage is not, as has often been thought, a counsel of worldly prudence. Holtzmann ascribes this meaning, if not to the Lord, at least to Luke. But the very term *parable* (ver. 7) and the adage of ver. 11 protest against this supposition, and admit of our giving to the saying no other than a religious sense and a spiritual application; comp. xviii. 14. In a winning and appropriate form Jesus gives the guests a lesson in humility, in the deepest sense of the word. Every one ought in heart to take, and ever take again, the last place before God, or as St. Paul says, Phil. ii. 3, to regard others *as better than himself.* The judgment of God will perhaps be different; but in this way we run no other risk than that of being exalted. Ἐπέχων, fixing His attention on that habitual way of acting among the Pharisees (Luke xx. 46). Ewald and Holtzmann darken counsel about the word *wedding* (ver. 8), which does not suit a simple repast like this. But Jesus in this verse is not speaking of the present repast, but of a supposed feast.—The proper reading is ἀνάπεσε, not ἀνάπεσαι —this verb has no middle—or ἀνάπεσον, which has only a few authorities.—*In the lowest place* (ver. 10), because in the interval all the intermediate seats had been occupied. The expression, *thou shalt have glory*, would be puerile, if it did not open up a glimpse of a *heavenly* reality.

3*d.* Vers. 12–14.[2]—The company is seated. Jesus, then observing that the guests in general belonged to the upper classes of society, addresses to His host a lesson on charity, which He clothes, like the preceding, in the graceful form of a recommendation of intelligent self-interest. The μήποτε, *lest* (ver. 12), carries a tone of liveliness and almost of pleasantry: "Beware of it; it is a misfortune to be avoided. For, once thou shalt have received human requital, it is all over with divine recompense." Jesus does not mean to forbid our entertaining those whom we love. He means simply: in

[1] Ver. 10. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn., ὅτι instead of ὅταν.—ℵ. A. B. L. X. 12 Mnn. Syr. add πάντων before τῶν συνανακειμένων.

[2] Ver. 14. ℵ. 5 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$, δέ instead of γάρ after ἀνταποδοθήσεται.

view of the life to come, thou canst do better still.—*Ἀνάπηροι*, those who are deprived of some one sense or limb, most frequently the blind or the lame; here, where those two categories are specially mentioned, the *maimed* in general.—In itself, the expression *resurrection of the just*, ver. 14, does not necessarily imply a distinction between two resurrections, the one of the just exclusively, the other general; it might signify merely, when the just shall rise at the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom. But as Luke xx. 35 evidently proves that this distinction was in the mind of Jesus, it is natural to explain the term from this point of view (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 16; Phil. iii. 11; Rev. xx.).

4th. Vers. 15–24.—The conversation which follows belongs to a later time in the feast. Jesus had been depicting the just seated at the Messiah's banquet, and receiving a superabundant equivalent for the least works of love which they have performed here below. This saying awakes in the heart of one of the guests a sweet anticipation of heavenly joys; or perhaps he seizes it as an occasion for laying a snare for Jesus, and leading Him to utter some heresy on the subject. The severe tendency of the following parable might favour this second interpretation. In any case, the enumeration of ver. 21 (comp. ver. 13) proves the close connection between those two parts of the conversation.

Vers. 15–20.[1]—*Ἄρτον φάγεσθαι* (fut. of *φάγω*) merely signifies, to be admitted to the heavenly feast. There is no allusion in the expression to the excellence of the meats which shall form this repast (ver. 1).—Jesus replies, "Yes, blessed; and therefore beware of rejecting the blessedness at the very moment when thou art extolling its greatness." Such is the application of the following parable. The word *πολλούς*, significant of numerous guests, ver. 16, is sufficiently justified when applied to the Jewish people alone; for this invitation includes all divine advances, at all periods of the theocracy. The last call given to the guests (ver. 17) relates to the ministries of John the Baptist and of Jesus Himself.

[1] Ver. 15. The Mnn. are divided between *ος* (T. R.) and *οστις* (Alex.) before *φαγεται*.—Instead of *αρτον*, some Mjj. (Byz.) 130 Mnn. Syr^{cur}., *αριστον*.—Ver. 16. ℵ. B. R. Syr^{cur}., *εποιει* instead of *εποιησεν*.—Ver. 17. ℵ* B. L. R. It^{allq}. omit *παντα* after *εστιν* (or *ησαν*).

It cannot be proved that it was usual to send a message at the last moment; but the hour was come, and nobody appeared. This touch brings out the ill-will of those invited; there was no possibility of their forgetting. The expression, *all things are ready*, describes the glorious freeness of salvation. —The excuses put forth by the invited, vers. 18–20, are not in earnest; for, warned as they were long beforehand, they could have chosen another day for their different occupations. The choice made, which is at the bottom of those refusals, betrays itself in the uniformity of their answers. It is like a refrain (*ἀπὸ μιᾶς*, understand: *φωνῆς* or *γνώμης*, ver. 18). They have passed the word to one another. The true reason is evidently the antipathy which they feel to him who invites them; comp. John xv. 24: "*They have hated both me and my Father.*"

Vers. 21–24.[1]—In the report which the servant gives of his mission, we may hear, as Stier so well observes, the echo of the sorrowful lamentations uttered by Jesus over the hardening of the Jews during His long nights of prayer. The *anger* of the master (*ὀργισθείς*) is the retaliation for the hatred which he discovers at the bottom of their refusals.— The first supplementary invitation which he commissions his servant to give, represents the appeal addressed by Jesus to the lowest classes of Jewish society, those who are called, xv. 1, *publicans and sinners*. *Πλατεῖαι*, the larger streets, which widen out into squares. *Ῥῦμαι*, the small cross streets. There is no going out yet from the city.—The second supplementary invitation (vers. 22 and 23) represents the calling of the Gentiles; for those to whom it is addressed are no longer inhabitants of the city. The love of God is great: it requires a multitude of guests; it will not have a seat left empty. The number of the elect is, as it were, determined beforehand by the riches of divine glory, which cannot find a complete reflection without a certain number of human beings. The invitation will therefore be continued, and consequently the history of our race prolonged, until that number be reached. Thus the divine decree is reconciled with human liberty. In comparison with the number called,

[1] Ver. 21. 9 Mjj. 12 Mnn. It. Vg. omit *τότε* after *δοῦλος*.—Ver. 22. ℵ. B. D. L. R. Syr$^{cur.}$, *ὁ* instead of *ὡς* before *ἐπιτεταξας*.

there are undoubtedly few saved through the fault of the former; but nevertheless, speaking absolutely, there are very many saved. *Φραγμοί*, the hedges which enclose properties, and beneath which vagrants squat. The phrase, *compel them to come in*, applies to people who would like to enter, but are yet kept back by a false timidity. The servant is to push them, in a manner, into the house *in spite of their scruples*. The object, therefore, is not to extinguish their liberty, but rather to restore them to it. For they would; but they dare not.—As ver. 21 is the text of the first part of Acts (i.–xii., conversion of the Jews), vers. 22 and 23 are the text of the second (xiii. to the end, conversion of the Gentiles), and indeed of the whole present economy. Weizsäcker accuses Luke of having added to the original parable this distinction between two new invitations, and that in favour of Paul's mission to the Gentiles. If this saying were the only one which the evangelists put into the mouth of Jesus regarding the calling of the Gentiles, this suspicion would be conceivable. But does not the passage xiii. 28–30 already express this idea? and is not this saying found in Matthew as well as in Luke? Comp. also Matt. xxiv. 14; John x. 16.—According to several commentators, ver. 24 does not belong to the parable; it is the application of it addressed by Jesus to all the guests (*"I say unto you"*). But the subject of the verb, *I say*, is evidently still the host of the parable; the pron. *you* designates the persons gathered round him at the time when he gives this order. Only the solemnity with which Jesus undoubtedly passed His eyes over the whole assembly, while putting this terrible threat into the mouth of the master in the parable, made them feel that at that very moment the scene described was actually passing between Him and them.

The parable of the great feast related Matt. xxii. 1–14 has great resemblances to this; but it differs from it as remarkably. More generalized in the outset, it becomes toward the end more detailed, and takes even a somewhat complex character. It may be, as Bleek thinks, a combination of two parables originally distinct. This seems to be proved by certain touches, such as the royal dignity of the host, the destruction by his armies of the city inhabited by those first

invited, and then everything relating to the man who had come in without a wedding garment. Nothing, on the contrary, could be more simple and complete than the delineation of Luke.

4. *A Warning against hasty Professions:* xiv. 25–35.—The journey resumes its course; great crowds follow Jesus. There is consequently an attraction to His side. This appears in the plurals ὄχλοι, *multitudes,* the adjective πολλοί, and the imperfect of duration συνεπορεύοντο, *were accompanying Him.* This brief introduction, as in similar cases, gives the key to the following discourse, which embraces: 1*st.* A warning (vers. 26 and 27); 2*d.* Two parables (vers. 28–32); 3*d.* A conclusion, clothed in a new figure (vers. 33–35).

Vers. 25–27.[1] "*And there went great multitudes with Him: and He turned, and said unto them,* 26. *If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.* 27. *And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.*"—Seeing those crowds, Jesus is aware that between Him and them there is a misunderstanding. The gospel, rightly apprehended, will not be the concern of the multitude. He lifts His voice to reveal this false situation: You are going up with me to Jerusalem, as if you were repairing to a feast. But do you know what it is for a man to join himself to my company? It is to abandon what is dearest and most vital (ver. 26), and to accept what is most painful—the cross (ver. 27).—*Coming to me* (ver. 26) denotes outward attachment to Jesus; *being my disciple,* at the end of the verse, actual dependence on His person and Spirit. That the former may be changed into the latter, and that the bond between Jesus and the professor may be durable, there must be effected in him a painful breach with everything which is naturally dear to him. The word *hate* in this passage is often interpreted in the sense of *loving less.* Bleek quotes examples, which are not without force. Thus, Gen. xxix. 30, 31. It is also the meaning of Matthew's paraphrase (x. 37), ὁ φιλῶν . . . ὑπὲρ ἐμέ. Yet it is simpler to keep the natural sense of the word hate, if it offers an admissible application. And this

[1] Ver. 27. This verse is omitted by M. R. r. and very many Mnn. (by *homoioteleuton*).—א. B. L. Cop. omit και before οστις.

we find when we admit that Jesus is here regarding the well-beloved ones whom He enumerates as representatives of our natural life, that life, strictly and radically selfish, which separates us from God. Hence He adds: *Yea, and his own life also;* this word forms the key to the understanding of the word *hate.* At bottom, our *own* life is the only thing to be hated. Everything else is to be hated only in so far as it partakes of this principle of sin and death. According to Deut. xxi. 18–21, when a man showed himself determinedly vicious or impious, his father and mother were to be the first to take up stones to stone him. Jesus in this place only spiritualizes this precept. The words: *Yea, and his own life also,* thus remove from this hatred every notion of sin, and allow us to see in it nothing but an aversion of a purely moral kind.

There are not only affections to be sacrificed, bonds to be broken; there are sufferings to be undergone in the following of Jesus. The emblem of those positive evils is *the cross,* that punishment the most humiliating and painful of all, which had been introduced into Israel since the Roman subjugation. —Without supplying an οὐκ before ἔρχεται, we might translate: "Whosoever doth not bear . . . , *and who nevertheless cometh after me. . . .*" But this interpretation is far from natural.— Those well-disposed crowds who were following Jesus without real conversion had never imagined anything like this. Jesus sets before their very eyes these two indispensable conditions of true faith by two parables (vers. 28–32).

Vers. 28–30.[1] *The Improvident Builder.*—Building here is the image of the Christian life, regarded in its positive aspect: the foundation and development of the work of God in the heart and life of the believer. The *tower,* a lofty edifice which strikes the eye from afar, represents a mode of living distinguished from the common, and attracting general attention. New professors often regard with complaceney what distinguishes them outwardly from the world. But building costs something; and the work once begun must be finished, under penalty of being exposed to public ridicule. One should

[1] Ver. 28. B. D. L. R. It[aliq.] omit τα, and the same with 13 other Mjj. 50 Mnn. read ις instead of προς before απαρτισμον. T. R., τα προς απαρτισμον, with F. V. X. Π. many Mnn.

therefore have first made his estimates, and accepted the inroad upon his capital which will result from such an undertaking. His capital is his own life, which he is called to spend, and to spend wholly in the service of his sanctification. The work of God is not seriously pursued, unless a man is daily sacrificing some part of that which constitutes the natural fortune of the human heart, particularly the affections, which are so deep, referred to, ver. 26. Before, therefore, any one puts himself forward as a professor, it is all important that he should have calculated this future expenditure, and thoroughly made up his mind not to recoil from any of those sacrifices which fidelity will entail. *Sitting down* and *counting* are emblems of the serious acts of recollection and meditation which should precede a true profession. This was precisely what Jesus had done in the wilderness. But what happens when this condition is neglected? After having energetically pronounced himself, the new professor recoils step by step from the consequences of the position which he has taken up. He stops short in the sacrifice of his natural life; and this inconsistency provokes the contempt and ridicule of the world, which soon discovers that he who had separated himself from it with so much parade, is after all but one of its own. Nothing injures the gospel like those relapses, the ordinary results of hasty profession.

Vers. 31, 32.[1] *The Improvident Warrior.*—Here we have an emblem of the Christian life, regarded on its negative or polemical side. The Christian is a king, but a king engaged in a struggle, and a struggle with an enemy materially stronger than himself. Therefore, before defying him with a declaration of war by the open profession of the gospel, a man must have taken counsel with himself, and become assured that he is willing to accept the extreme consequences of this position, even to the giving up of his life if demanded; this condition is expressed ver. 27. Would not a little nation like the Swiss bring down ridicule on itself by declaring war with France, if it were not determined to die nobly on the field of battle? Would not Luther have acted like a fool when he affixed his theses to the church door, or burned the Papal bull, had he

[1] Ver. 31. ℵ. B. It^{plerique}, βουλευσεται instead of βουλευσαι.—The Mss. are divided between απαντησαι (T. R.) and υπαντησαι (Alex.).

not first made the sacrifice of his life in the inner court of his heart? It is heroical to engage in a struggle for a just and holy cause, but on one condition: that is, that we have accepted death beforehand as the end of the way; otherwise this declaration of war is nothing but rodomontade. The words: *whether he is able*, have a slight touch of irony; able to conquer, and, as under such conditions that is impossible, to die in the unequal struggle. Ver. 32 has been regarded either as a call to us to take account of our weakness, that we may ask the help *of God* (Olshausen), or a summons promptly to seek reconciliation *with God* (Gerlach). Both interpretations are untenable, because the hostile king challenged by the declaration of war is not God, but the prince of this world. It is therefore much rather a warning which Jesus gives to those who profess discipleship, but who have not decided to risk everything, to make their submission as early as possible to the world and its prince. Better avoid celebrating a Palm-day than end after such a demonstration with a Good Friday! Rather remain an honourable man, unknown religiously, than become what is sadder in the world, an inconsistent Christian. A warning, therefore, to those who formed the attendants of Jesus, to make their peace speedily with the Sanhedrim, if they are not resolved to follow their new Master to the cross! Jesus drew this precept also from His own experience. He had made his reckoning in the wilderness with the prince of this world, and with life, before beginning His work publicly. Gess rightly says: "Those two parables show with what seriousness Jesus had Himself prepared for death."

Vers. 33–35.[1] *The Application of those two Parables, with a new Figure confirming it.*—"*So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.* 34. *Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned?* 35. *It is neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill; but men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*"—Here is the summing up of the warning which was intended to calm the unreflecting enthusiasm of those multitudes. The expression: *forsaketh all that he hath*, natural

[1] Ver. 34. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn. add ουν after καλον.—ℵ. B. D. L. X. 8 Mnn. Itplerique, εαν δε και instead of εαν δε.

life, as well as all the affections and all the goods fitted to satisfy it, sums up the two conditions indicated vers. 26 (the giving up of enjoyment) and 27 (the acceptance of the cross). *Salt* (ver. 34) corrects the tastelessness of certain substances, and preserves others from corruption; the marvellous efficacy of this agent on materials subjected to its quickening energy is a good thing, and even good to observe (*καλόν*). In this twofold relation, it is the emblem of the sharp and austere savour of holiness, of the action of the gospel on the natural life, the insipidity and frivolity of which are corrected by the Divine Spirit. No more beautiful spectacle in the moral world than this action of the gospel through the instrumentality of the consistent Christian on the society around him. But if the Christian himself by his unfaithfulness destroys this holy power, no means will restore to him the savour which it was his mission to impart to the world. *Ἀρτυθήσεται* might be taken impersonally: "If there is no more salt, wherewith *shall men salt* (things)?" But Jesus is not here describing the evil results of Christian unfaithfulness to the world or the gospel; it is the professor himself who is concerned (ver. 35: *men cast it out*). The subject of the verb is therefore, *ἅλας*, salt itself; comp. Mark ix. 50: *ἐν τίνι ἀρτύσετε αὐτό*; "wherewith will ye season *it?*" Salt which has become savourless is fit for nothing; it cannot serve the soil as *earth*, nor pasture as *dung*. It is only good to be *cast out*, says Luke; *trodden under foot of men*, says Matt. v. 13. Salt was sometimes used to cover slippery ways (*Erub.* f. 104. 1: *Spargunt salem in clivo ne nutent* (pedes). A reserved attitude towards the gospel is therefore a less critical position than an open profession followed by declension. In the moral as in the physical world, without previous heating there is no deadly chill. Jesus seems to say that the life of nature may have its usefulness in the kingdom of God, either in the form of mundane (*land*) respectability, or even as a life completely corrupted and depraved (*dung*). In the first case, indeed, it is the soil wherein the germ of the higher life may be sown; and in the second, it may at least call forth a moral reaction among those who feel indignation or disgust at the evil, and drive them to seek life from on high; while the unfaithfulness of the Christian disgusts men with the gospel itself. The expression:

cast out (give over to perdition, John xv. 6), forms the transition to the final call: *He that hath ears* . . . .

This discourse is the basis of the famous passage, Heb. vi. 4–8. The commentators who have applied it to the rejection of the Jews have not sufficiently considered the context, and especially the introduction, ver. 25, which, notwithstanding Holtzmann's contemptuous treatment, is, as we have just seen, the key of the whole piece. Matthew places the apophthegm, vers. 34, 35, in that passage of the Sermon on the Mount where the grandeur of the Christian calling is described (v. 13–16). Perhaps he was led to put it there by the analogy of the saying to the immediately following one: "*Ye are the light of the world.*" Mark places it, like Luke, towards the end of the Galilean ministry (ix. 50); and such a warning is better explained at a more advanced period. Besides, like so many other general maxims, it may perfectly well have been uttered twice.

5. *The Parables of Grace:* chap. xv.—This piece contains: 1*st.* A historical introduction (vers. 1 and 2); 2*d.* A pair of parables, like that of the previous chapter (vers. 3–10); and 3*d.* A great parable, which forms the summing up and climax of the two preceding (vers. 11–32). The relation is like that between the three allegories, John x. 1–18.

1*st.* Vers. 1 and 2.[1] *The Introduction.*—If Weizsäcker had sufficiently weighed the bearing of the analytical form ἦσαν ἐγγίζοντες, *they were drawing near*, which denotes a state of things more or less permanent, he would not have accused Luke (p. 139) of transforming into the event of a particular time a very common situation in the life of Jesus. It is on the basis of this habitual state of things that the point of time (aor. εἶπε, ver. 3) is marked off when Jesus related the following parables. Holtzmann finds nothing in this introduction but an invention of Luke himself. In any case, Luke places us once more, by this short historical introduction, at the point of view for understanding the whole of the following discourse.—What drew those sinners to Jesus was their finding in Him not that righteousness, full of pride and contempt, with which the Pharisees assailed them, but a holiness which was associated with the tenderest love. The *publicans* and *sinners* had broken with Levitical purity and Israelitish respectability; the former by their business, the others by their life. They were *outlaws* in Israel. But were

[1] Ver. 2. ℵ. B. D. L. add τε after οἱ.

they finally lost on that account? Undoubtedly, the normal way of entering into union with God would have been through fidelity to the theocracy; but the coming of the Saviour opened another to those who, by their guilt, had shut the first against them. And that was exactly the thing which had exasperated the zealots of Levitical observances. Rather than recognise in Jesus one who had understood the merciful purpose of God, they preferred to explain the compassionate welcome which He gave to sinners by His secret sympathy with sin. *Προσδέχεσθαι, to receive with welcome,* refers to kindly relations in general; *συνεσθίειν, to eat with,* to the decisive act in the manners of that time by which He did not fear to seal this connection.

2*d.* Vers. 3–10. The two parables of the *lost sheep* and of the *lost drachma,* as such pairs of parables always do, present the same idea, but in two different aspects. The idea common to both is the solicitude of God for sinners; the difference is, that in the first instance this solicitude arises from the compassion with which *their misery* inspires Him, in the second from the *value* which He attaches to their persons. The two descriptions are intended to show that the conduct of Jesus toward those despised beings corresponds in all respects to that compassionate solicitude, and so to justify the instrument of divine love. If God cannot be accused of secret sympathy with sin, how could Jesus possibly be so when carrying His purpose into execution?

Vers. 3–7.[1] *The Lost Sheep.*—God seeks sinners, because the sinner is a miserable being deserving pity: such is the meaning of this description. The parable is put in the form of a question. In point of fact, it is at once an *argumentum ad hominem* and an argument *a fortiori:* "What do ye yourselves in such a case? And besides, the case is like: a sheep, a man!"—*Which of you?* "There is not a single one of you who accuse me here who does not act exactly like me in similar circumstances." *Ἄνθρωπος, man,* is tacitly contrasted with God (ver. 7).—The *hundred sheep* represent the totality of the theocratic people; the *lost sheep,* that portion of the people which has broken with legal ordinances, and so lives under the impulse of its own passions; the *ninety and*

[1] Ver. 4. 6 Mjj. several Mnn. add *ov* after *ως.*

nine, the majority which has remained outwardly faithful to the law. Ἔρημος, which we translate *wilderness*, simply denotes in the East uncultivated plains, pasturage, in opposition to tilled fields. It is the natural resort of sheep, but without the notion of danger and barrenness, which we connect with the idea of wilderness. This place where the flock feeds represents the more or less normal state of the faithful Jews, in which the soul is kept near to God under the shelter of commandments and worship. The shepherd *leaves* them there: they have only to walk faithfully in the way marked out for them; they will be infallibly led on to a higher state (John iii. 21, v. 46, vi. 45, vii. 17). While waiting, their moral position is safe enough to allow the Saviour to consecrate Himself more specially to the souls of those who, having broken with the covenant and its means of grace, are exposed to the most imminent dangers. The anxiety of the shepherd to recover a strayed sheep has more than personal interest for its motive. One sheep in a hundred is a loss of too small importance, and in any case out of proportion to the pains which he takes. The motive which animates him is compassion. Is there, in reality, a creature in the animal world more to be pitied than a strayed sheep? It is destitute both of the instinct necessary to find its way, and of every weapon of self-defence. It is a prey to any beast which may meet it; it deserves, as no other being in nature, the name of *lost*. The compassion of the shepherd appears: 1. In his perseverance: he seeks it *until* (ver. 4); 2. In his tender care: he *layeth it on his shoulders*; 3. In the *joy* with which he takes his burden (ἐπιτίθησιν χαίρων), a joy such that he wishes to share it with those who surround him, and that he reckons on receiving their congratulations (ver. 6).

Every touch in this exquisite picture finds its application by means of the situation described, vers. 1 and 2. The search for the sheep corresponds with the act which the Pharisees blamed: *He receiveth sinners, and eateth with them*; the finding, to that moment of unspeakable joy, when Jesus sees one of those lost souls returning to God; the tenderness with which the shepherd carries his sheep, to the care which divine grace will henceforth take of the soul thus recovered for God; the joy of the shepherd, to that which

Jesus, that which God Himself, feels in the salvation of sinners; the congratulations of friends and neighbours, to the thanksgivings and praises of glorified men and angels. It is to be remarked that the shepherd does not carry back the sheep to the pasture, but to his own dwelling. By this touch, Jesus undoubtedly gives us to understand, that the sinners whom He has come to save are transported by Him into an order of things superior to that of the theocracy to which they formerly belonged—into the communion of *heaven* represented by the shepherd's house (ver. 7).

Ver. 7 contains the application of the description, or more exactly, the conclusion of the argument: "If pity leads you to show such tenderness to a sheep, am I wrong in showing it to lost souls? I say unto you, that what I feel and do is what God Himself feels and wishes; and what offends you here below on the earth is what causes rejoicing in the heavens. It is for you to judge from this contrast, whether, while you have no need perhaps to change your life, you do not need a change of heart!"—The words: *there shall be more joy*, are frequently explained *anthropopathically:* the recovery of a lost object gives us in the first moment a livelier joy than anything which we possess without previous loss. If we found this feature in the parable, the explanation might be discussed. But it meets us in the application, and we cannot see how such a sentiment could be absolutely ascribed to God. We have just seen that the state of the recovered sinner is really superior to that of the believing Israelite. The latter, without having to charge himself with gross disorders (*μετανοεῖν, to repent,* in the sense of those to whom Jesus is speaking), has nevertheless one decisive step more to take, in order that his salvation may be consummated, and that God may rejoice fully on his account; that is, to recognise his inward sin, to embrace the Saviour, and to be changed in heart. Till then his regulated walk within the bosom of the ancient covenant is only provisional, like the whole of that covenant itself. It may easily happen that, like the Pharisees, such a man should end by rejecting real salvation, and so perishing. How should heaven rejoice over a state so imperfect, with a joy like that which is awakened among its inhabitants by the sight of a sinner really saved? It is

evident that in this saying we must take the word *just* (as well as the word *repent*) in the sense given to it by the interlocutors of Jesus, that relative meaning which we have already found, vers. 31, 32: the just, Levitically and theocratically speaking. This righteousness is nothing; it is the directest way to conduct to true righteousness; but on condition that a man does not rest in it. It thus affords a certain occasion for joy in heaven,—this is implied in the comparative, *joy more than . . .*,—but less joy, however, than the salvation of a single soul fully realized. That is already evident from the contrast established by this verse between the joy of heaven and the discontent of the Pharisees on occasion of the same event (ver. 1). The *I say unto you* has here, as everywhere, a special solemnity. Jesus speaks of heavenly things as a witness (John iii. 11) and as an interpreter of the thoughts of God. The words *in heaven* embrace God and the beings who surround Him, those who are represented in the parable by *the friends and neighbours*. The conjunction ἤ supposes a μᾶλλον which is not expressed. This form is explained by the blending of two ideas: "*there is joy*" (hence the absence of μᾶλλον), "there is *yet more than . . .*" (and hence the ἤ). This form delicately expresses the idea indicated above, that there is also a certain satisfaction in heaven on account of the righteousness of sincere Israelites.—How can one help being struck with the manner in which Jesus, both in this parable and the two following, identifies His feelings and conduct absolutely with the feelings and the action of God Himself? The shepherd seeking, the woman finding, the father welcoming,—is it not in His person that God accomplishes all those divine works?

This parable is placed by Matthew in the great discourse of chap. xviii., and—Bleek cannot help acknowledging—because of an association of ideas belonging purely to the evangelist himself. Indeed, the application which he makes of the lost sheep to the *little ones* (vers. 1–6 and 10; ver. 11 is an interpolation) is certainly not in keeping with the original sense of this parable. The original reference of this description to lost sinners, as Holtzmann says in the same connection, has been *preserved by Luke*. But how in this case are we to explain how Matthew has wrested the parable from its original meaning, if he copied the same document as Luke (A, according to Holtzmann)? Besides, how comes it that Matthew omits the following parable, that of the drachma, which Luke, according

to this critic, takes, as well as the preceding, from the common document?

Vers. 8–10.[1] *The Lost Drachma.*—The anxiety of the woman to find her lost piece of money certainly does not proceed from a feeling of pity; it is *self-interest* which leads her to act. She had painfully earned it, and had kept it in reserve for some important purpose; it is a real loss to her. Here is divine love portrayed from an entirely different side. The sinner is not only, in the eyes of God, a suffering being, like the sheep on whom He takes pity; he is a precious being, created in His image, to whom He has assigned a part in the accomplishment of His plans. A lost man is a blank in His treasury. Is not this side of divine love, rightly understood, still more striking than the preceding?

The general features, as well as the minutest details, of the description are fitted to bring into prominence this idea of the value which God attaches to a lost soul. General features: 1. The idea of *loss* (ver. 8*a*); 2. The *persevering care* which the woman expends in seeking the drachma (ver. 8*b*); 3. Her *overflowing joy* when she has found it (ver. 9).—Details: The woman has laboriously earned this small sum, and saved it only at the cost of many privations, and for some urgent necessity. Jesus leaves out the ἐξ ὑμῶν, *of you*, of ver. 4. Perhaps there were none but men in the throng, or if otherwise, He was addressing them only. For the number 100, ver. 4, He substitutes the number 10; the loss of one in 10 is more serious than of one in 100.—The drachma was worth about eightpence. It was the price of a full day's work. Comp. Matt. xx. 2, where the master agrees with the labourers for *a penny* (a sum nearly equivalent to eightpence) a day, and Rev. vi. 6.—With what minute pains are the efforts of this woman described, and what a charming interior is the picture of her persevering search! She lights her lamp; for in the East the apartment has no other light than that which is admitted by the door; she removes every article of furniture, and sweeps the most dusty corners. Such is the image of God coming down in the person of Jesus into the company of the lowest among sinners, following them to the very

[1] Ver. 8. ℵ. B. L. X. 10 Mnn., ως ου instead of ως ου.—Ver. 9. 6 Mjj. 25 Mnn., συγκαλει instead of συγκαλειται.

dens of the theocracy, with the light of divine truth. The figure of the sheep referred rather to the publicans; that of the drachma applies rather to the second class mentioned in ver. 1, the *ἁμαρτωλοί*, beings plunged in vice.

In depicting the joy of the woman (ver. 9), Luke substitutes the Middle *συγκαλεῖται, she calleth to herself*, for the Active *συγκαλεῖ, she calleth*, ver. 6; the Alex. have ill-advisedly obliterated this shade. It is not, as in the preceding parable, the object lost which profits by the finding; it is the woman herself, who had lost something of her own; and so she claims to be congratulated *for herself;* hence the Middle. This shade of expression reflects the entire difference of meaning between the two parables. It is the same with another slight modification. Instead of the expression of ver. 6: "For I have found my sheep *which was lost* (*τὸ ἀπολωλός*)," the woman says here: "the piece which *I had lost* (*ἣν ἀπώλεσα*)"; the first phrase turned attention to the sheep and its distress; the second attracts our interest to the woman, disconsolate about her loss.—What grandeur belongs to the picture of this humble rejoicing which the poor woman celebrates with her neighbours, when it becomes the transparency through which we get a glimpse of God Himself, rejoicing with His elect and His angels over the salvation of a single sinner, even the chief! The *ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγ., in the presence of the angels*, may be explained in two ways: either by giving to the word *joy* the meaning *subject of joy*,—in that case, this saying refers directly to the joy of the angels themselves,—or by referring the word *χαρά* to the joy *of God* which breaks forth *in presence* of the angels, and in which they participate. The first sense is the more natural.

But those two images, borrowed from the animal and inanimate world, remain too far beneath their object. They did not furnish Jesus with the means of displaying the full riches of feeling which filled the heart of God toward the sinner, nor of unveiling the sinner's inner history in the drama of conversion. For that, He needed an image borrowed from the domain of moral and sensitive nature, the sphere of human life. The word which sums up the first two parables is *grace;* that which sums up the third is *faith.*

Vers. 11–32. *The Child lost and found.*—This parable

consists of two distinct descriptions, which form the counterpart of one another, that of the younger son (vers. 11–24), and that of the elder son (vers. 25–32). By the second, Jesus returns completely, as we shall see, to the historical situation described vers. 1, 2, and the scene is closed.

Vers. 11–24. *The younger Son.*—This first part of the parable embraces four representations corresponding to the four phases of the converted sinner's life: 1*st.* Sin (vers. 11–13); 2*d.* Misery (vers. 14–16); 3*d.* Conversion (vers. 17–20*a*); 4*th.* Restoration (vers. 20*b*–24).

Vers. 11–13.[1]—Jesus discontinues the interrogative form used in the two previous cases: we have no more an argument; we have a narrative, a real parable. The three persons composing the family represent God and His people. In accordance with vers. 1, 2, the elder son, the representative of the race, the prop of the *gens*, and as such more deeply attached than the younger to the land of his household hearth, personifies the Israelites who were Levitically irreproachable, and especially the Pharisees. The younger, in whose case the family bond is weaker, and whom this very circumstance renders more open to the temptation of breaking with it, represents those who have abandoned Jewish legalism, publicans and people of immoral lives. His demand for his goods is most probably to be explained by the fact that the elder received as his inheritance a double share of the patrimonial lands, the younger members a single share (see at xii. 13). The latter then desired that his father, anticipating the division, should give him the equivalent of his portion in money, an arrangement in virtue of which the entire domain, on the father's death, would come to the elder. Two things impel him to act thus: the air of the paternal home oppresses him, he feels the constraint of his father's presence; then the world without attracts him, he hopes to enjoy himself. But to realize his wishes, he needs two things—freedom and money. Here is the image of a heart swayed by licentious appetites; God is the obstacle in its way, and freedom to do anything appears to it as the condition of happiness. Money ought not to be taken as a figure applied to the talents and graces which the sinner has received; it simply represents here the

[1] Ver. 12. ℵ° A. B. L., ὁ δέ instead of καί.

power of satisfying one's tastes.—In the father's consenting to the guilty wish of his son, a very solemn thought is expressed, that of the sinner's abandonment to the desires of his own heart, the παραδιδόναι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις (Rom. i. 24, 26, 28), the ceasing on the part of the Divine Spirit to strive against the inclinations of a spoiled heart, which can only be cured by the bitter experiences of sin. God gives such a man over to his folly. The use which the sinner makes of his sadly-acquired liberty is described in ver. 13. All those images of sin blended in many respects, so far as the sinners present were concerned, with actual facts. The *far country* to which the son flies is the emblem of the state of a soul which has so strayed, that the thought of God no longer even occurs to it. The complete dissipation of his goods represents the carrying out of man's liberty to its furthest limits. Μακράν is not an adjective, but an adverb (ver. 20, vii. 6, etc.).

Vers. 14–16.[1]—The liberty of self-enjoyment is not unlimited, as the sinner would fain think; it has limits of two kinds: the one pertaining to the individual himself, such as satiety, remorse, the feeling of destitution and abjectness resulting from vice (*when he had spent all*); the other arising from certain unfavourable outward circumstances, here represented by the famine which occurs at this crisis, that is, domestic or public calamities which complete the subduing of the heart which has been already overwhelmed, and further, the absence of all divine consolation. Let those two causes of misery coincide, and wretchedness is at its height. Then happens what Jesus calls ὑστερεῖσθαι, *to be in want*, the absolute void of a heart which has sacrificed everything for pleasure, and which has nothing left but suffering. We can hardly avoid seeing, in the ignoble dependence into which this young Jew falls under a heathen master, an *allusion* to the position of the publicans who were engaged in the service of the Roman power. But the general *idea* which corresponds to this touch is that of the degrading dependence, in respect of the world, to which the vicious man always finds himself reduced in the end. He sought pleasure, he finds pain; he

[1] Ver. 14. ℵ. A. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., ισχυρα instead of ισχυρος.—Ver. 16. ℵ. B. D. L. R. some Mnn. Syr^cur. It^aliq., χορτασθηναι εκ instead of γεμισαι την κοιλιαν αυτου απο.

wished freedom, he gets bondage. The word ἐκολλήθη has in it something abject; the unhappy wretch is a sort of appendage to a strange personality. *To feed swine,* the last business for a Jew. Κεράτιον denotes a species of coarse bean, used in the East for fattening those animals. At ver. 16, the Alex. Mjj. are caught in the very act of purism; men of delicate taste could not bear the gross expression, *to fill the belly with* . . . There was therefore substituted in the public reading the more genteel term, *to satisfy himself with* . . .; and this correction has passed into the Alex. text. The act expressed by the received reading is that, not of relishing food, but merely of filling a void. The smallest details are to the life in this portraiture.—During this time of famine, when the poor herdsman's allowance did not suffice to appease his hunger, he was reduced to covet the coarse bean with which the herd was carefully fattened, when he drove it home: the swine were in reality more precious than he. They sold high, an image of the contempt and neglect which the profligate experiences from that very world to which he has sacrificed the most sacred feelings.

Vers. 17–20*a*.[1] This representation, which depicts the conversion of the sinner, includes two things, repentance (ver. 17) and faith (vers. 18–20*a*).—The words, *when he came to himself,* ver. 17, denote a solemn moment in human life, that in which the heart, after a long period of dissipation, for the first time becomes self-collected. The heart is God's sanctuary. To come to ourselves is therefore to find God. Repentance is a change of feeling; we find it fully depicted in the regret which the sinner feels for that from which he has fled (the father's house), and in that horror which fills him at that which he sought so ardently (the strange land). As to the mercenaries whom he envies, might they not represent those heathen proselytes who had a place, although a very inferior one (the outer court), in the temple, and who might thus from afar take part in the worship; advantages from which the publicans, so long as they kept to their profession, were debarred by the excommunication which fell on them.—From

[1] Ver. 17. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn., ἐφη instead of εἶπεν.—A. B. P., περισσευονται instead of περισσευουσιν.—6 Mjj. some Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg. add ὠδε to λιμῳ.—Ver. 19. 16 Mjj. 40 Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit και before συκιτι.

this change of feeling there springs a resolution (ver. 18), which rests on a remnant of confidence in the goodness of his father; this is the dawn of faith. Did we not recollect that we are yet in the parable, the meaning of the words *before thee* would appear to blend with that of the preceding, *against heaven*. But in the image adopted the two expressions have a distinct meaning. *Heaven* is the avenger of all holy feelings when outraged, and particularly of filial devotion when trampled under foot. The young man *sinned before* his father at the time when, the latter beholding him with grief, he defied his last look, and obstinately turned his back on him.—The possibility of an immediate and entire restoration does not enter his mind. He is ready to take the position of a servant in the house where he lived as a son, but where he shall have at least wherewith to satisfy his hunger. Here is portrayed that publican (described in chap. xviii.) who stood afar off, and dared not even raise his eyes to God. But the essential fact is, that the resolution once taken, he carries it out. Here is faith in its fulness, actually arising, going to God. Faith is not a thought or a desire; it is an act which brings two living beings into personal contact.—What an impression must have been produced on the publicans present by this faithful picture of their past and present experiences! But how much deeper still the emotion which awaits them when they hear Jesus unveiling, in the sequel, the feelings and conduct of God Himself toward them!

Vers. 20*b*–24.[1] Free pardon, entire restoration, the joys of adoption,—such are the contents of these verses. The heart of God overflows in the sayings of Jesus. Every word vibrates with emotion, at once the tenderest and the holiest. The father seems never to have given up waiting for his son; perceiving him from afar, he runs to meet him. God discerns the faintest sigh after good which breaks forth in a wanderer's heart; and from the moment this heart takes a step toward Him, He takes ten to meet it, striving to show it something

[1] Ver. 21. 7 Mjj. some Mnn. It. Vg. omit *και* before *ουκετι*.—א. B. D. U. X. 20 Mnn. add, after *υιος σου*, *ποιησον με ως ενα των μισθιων σου*.—Ver. 22. א. B. L. X. It. Vg. add *ταχυ* (D., *ταχιως*) before *εξενεγκατε*.—7 Mjj. (Alex.) omit *την* before *στολην*.—Ver. 23. א. B. L. R. X. It. Vg, *φερετε* instead of *ενεγκαντες*.—Ver. 24. 9 Mjj. 30 Mnn. It. Vg. omit *και* before *απολωλως ην*.

of His love. This history was exemplified at the very moment as between the publicans present and God, who was drawing near to them in Jesus. There is a wide difference between the confession uttered by the prodigal son, ver. 21, and that which had been extracted from him by the extremity of his misery (vers. 18, 19). The latter was a cry of despair; but now his distress is over. It is therefore the cry of repentant love. The terms are the same: *I have sinned;* but how different is the accent! Luther felt it profoundly; the discovery of the difference between the repentance of fear and that of love was the true principle of the Reformation.— He cannot come to the end; the very assurance of pardon prevents him from finishing and saying, *make me as . . .*, according to his first purpose. The Alex. have not understood this omission, and have mistakenly added here the last words of ver. 19.

Pardon involves restoration. No humbling novitiate; no passing through inferior positions. The restoration is as complete as the repentance was sincere and the faith profound. In all those touches—the shoes, the robe, the signet ring (the mark of the free man, fitted to express an independent will)—a sound exegesis should limit itself to finding the expression of the fulness of restoration to the filial standing; only homiletic application may allow itself to go further, though even it should beware of falling into a play of wit, as when Jerome and Olshausen see in the robe the righteousness of Christ, in the ring the seal of the Holy Spirit, in the shoes the power of walking in the ways of God. Others have found in the servants the image of the Holy Spirit or of pastors! The Alex. reject *τήν* before *στολήν*, and that justly. There is a gradation: first *a robe*, in opposition to nakedness; then, *and even the best*, because he who has descended lowest, if he rise again, should mount up highest. In the phrase, *the fatted calf*, ver. 23, the article should be observed. On every farm there is always *the* calf which is fattening for feast days. Jesus knows rural customs. Augustine and Jerome find in this calf an indication of the sacrifice of Christ! According to the *tout ensemble* of the picture, which should be our standard in interpreting all the special details, this emblem represents all that is most excellent and sweet in the com-

munications of divine grace. The absence of every feature fitted to represent the sacrifice of Christ, is at once explained when we remember that we have here to do with a parable, and that expiation has no place in the relations between man and man. By the plural, *let us be merry*, the father himself takes his share in the feast (as in ver. 7). The two parallel clauses of ver. 24 recall the two aspects in which sin was presented in the two previous parables; *he was dead* relates to the personal misery of the sinner (the lost sheep); *he was lost*, to the loss felt by God Himself (the lost drachma). The parable of the prodigal son combines those two points of view: the son was lost, and the father had lost something. With the words, *and they began to be merry*, the parable reaches the exact point at which things were at the moment when Christ uttered it (vers. 1 and 2).

Vers. 25–32. *The elder Son.*—This part embraces: 1*st.* The interview of the elder son with the servant (vers. 25–28*a*); 2*d.* His interview with his father (vers. 28*b*–32). Jesus here shows the Pharisees their murmurings put in action, and constrains them to feel their gravity.

Vers. 25–28*a*.[1] While the house is filled with mirth, the elder son is at work. Here is the image of the Pharisee busied with his rites, while repentant sinners are rejoicing in the serene sunshine of grace. Every free and joyous impulse is abhorrent to the formal spirit of pharisaism. This repugnance is described in ver. 26. Rather than go straight into the house, the elder son begins by gathering information from a servant; he does not feel himself *at home* in the house (John viii. 35). The servant in his answer substitutes for the expressions of the father: *he was dead . . ., lost . . .*, these simple words: *he is come safe and sound.* This is the fact, without the father's moral appreciation, which it is not fitting in him to appropriate. Everything in the slightest details of the picture breathes the most exquisite delicacy. The refusal to enter corresponds to the discontent of the Pharisees, who do not understand being saved in common with the vicious.

Vers. 28*b*–32.[2] This interview contains the full revelation

[1] Ver. 26. Αυτου after παιδων, in ℵ (not ℵ*), is only supported by some Mnn.

[2] Ver. 28. The Mss. are divided between ηθελεν (T. R.) and ηθελησεν, and between ο ουν (T. R.) and ο δε (Alex.).—Ver. 29. 7 Mjj. add αυτου to τω πατρι.

of pharisaic feeling, and brings into view the contrast between it and the fatherly heart of God. The procedure of the father, who steps out to his son and invites him to enter, is realized in the very conversation which Jesus, come from God, holds with them at the moment. The answer of the son (vers. 29 and 30) includes two accusations against his father: the one bears on his way of acting toward himself (ver. 29), the other on his conduct in respect of his other son (ver. 30). The contrast is meant to bring out the partiality of the father. The blind and innocent self-satisfaction which forms the heart of pharisaism could not be better depicted than in the words: "*neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment;*" and the servile and mercenary position of the legal Jew in the theocracy, than thus: "Lo! these many years *do I serve thee.*" Bengel makes the simple observation on these words: *servus erat.* What in reality was his father to him? A master! He even counts the years of his hard servitude: *There are so many years!* . . . Such is man's view of accomplishing good under the law: a labour painfully carried through, and which consequently merits payment. But by its very nature it is totally deprived of the delights which belong only to the sphere of free love; it has no other idea of them than that which it gets by seeing those joys of the reconciled sinner, by which it is scandalized. The joy which is wanting to it is this *kid to make merry with its friends,* which has never been granted to it.

With the hard and ill-paid labour of legal obedience he contrasts (ver. 30) the life of his brother, merry in sin, happier still, if possible, in the hour of his return and pardon. The meaning is, that in the eyes of pharisaism, as virtue is a task, sin is a pleasure; and hence there ought to be a payment for the first, an equivalent of pain for the second. The father, by refusing to the one his just reward, by adding in the case of the other joy to joy, the enjoyments of the paternal home to those of debauchery, has shown his preference for the sinner and his sympathy with sin. *Thy son,* says the elder son, instead of: *my brother.* He would express at once the par-

—Ver. 30. Instead of τον μοσχον τον σιτευτον, 6 Mjj., τον σιτευτον μοσχον.—Ver. 32. Instead of ανιζησιν (T. R.), ℵ* B. L. R. Δ. Syr^sch, ιζησιν.—ℵ. B. X. several Mnn. It. omit και, and A. B. D. L. R. X. ην, before απολωλως.

tiality of his father and his own dislike to the sinner. Do not those sayings which Jesus puts into the mouth of the righteous legalist, contain the keenest criticism of a state of soul wherein men discharge duty all the while abhorring it, and wherein, while avoiding sin, they thirst after it? The particular μετὰ πορνῶν is a stroke of the pencil added to the picture of ver. 13 by the charitable hand of the elder brother.

The father's answer meets perfectly the two accusations of his son. Ver. 31 replies to ver. 29; ver. 32 to ver. 30. The father first clears himself from the charge of injustice to the son who is speaking to him; and with what condescension! "*My child* (τέκνον)." This form of address has in it something more loving even than υἱε, *son*. Then he reminds him that his life with him might have been a feast all along. There was no occasion, therefore, to make a special feast for him. And what good would a particular gift serve, when everything in the house was continually at his disposal? The meaning of this remarkable saying is, that nothing prevented the believing Israelite from already enjoying the sweets of divine communion,—a fact proved by the Psalms; comp. *e.g.* Ps. xxiii. and lxiii. St. Paul himself, who ordinarily presents the law as the instrument of condemnation, nevertheless derives the formula of grace from a saying of Moses (Rom. x. 6–8), proving that in his eyes grace is already in the law, through the pardon which accompanies sacrifice and the Holy Spirit granted to him who asks Him (Ps. li. 9–14); and that when he speaks of the law as he ordinarily does, it is after the manner of his adversaries, isolating the commandment from grace. In the same way as ver. 31 presents theocratic fidelity as a happiness, and not a task, so ver. 32 reveals sin as a misery, and not as an advantage. There was therefore ground for celebrating a feast on the return of one who had just escaped from so great a misery, and by its arrival had restored the life of the family in its completeness. *Thy brother*, says the father; it is the answer to the *thy son* of ver. 30. He reminds him of the claims of fraternal love. Here Jesus stops; He does not say what part the elder son took. It lay with the Pharisees themselves, by the conduct which they would adopt, to decide this question and finish the narrative.

The Tübingen school (Zeller, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, not Köstlin) agree in regarding the elder son, not as the pharisaic party, but as the *Jewish people* in general; the younger son, not as the publicans, but *Gentile nations*. "The elder son is unmistakeably the image of Judaism, which deems that it possesses special merit because of its fidelity to the one true God. The younger son . . . is the not less easily recognised portrait of Gentile humanity given up to polytheism and immorality. The discontent of the first, on seeing the reception granted to his brother, represents the jealousy of the Jews on account of the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church" (Hilgenfeld, *die Evangel.* p. 198). It would follow, then: 1. that this parable had been invented and put into the mouth of Jesus by Luke, with the view of supporting the system of his master, Paul; 2. that to this invention he had added a second, intended to accredit the former, that of the historical situation described vers. 1 and 2. But, 1. Is it conceivable that the evangelist, who marked out his own programme for himself, i. 1–4, should take the liberty of treating his materials in so free and easy a style? 2. Have we not found in this description a multitude of delicate allusions to the historical surroundings amid which the parable is reputed to have been uttered, and which would not be applicable in the sense proposed (vers. 15, 17, etc.)? 3. How from this parable St. Paul might have extracted the doctrine of justification by faith, is easy to understand. But that this order was inverted, that the parable was invented as an after-thought to give a body to the Pauline doctrine, is incompatible with the absence of every dogmatic element in the exposition. Would not the names of repentance, faith, justification, and the idea of expiation, have been infallibly introduced, if it had been the result of a dogmatic study contemporary with the ministry of Paul? 4. We have seen that the description finds its perfect explanation, that there remains not a single obscure point in the light in which it is placed by Luke. It is therefore arbitrary to seek another setting for it. The prejudice which has led the Tübingen school to this contra-textual interpretation is evident.—Keim, while discovering, like this school, Paulinism as the basis of the parable (p. 80), thinks that here we have one of the passages wherein the author, with the view of conciliating, more or less abjures his master, St. Paul. The evangelist dares not wholly disapprove the Judeo-Christianity which holds by the commandments; he praises it even (ver. 31). He only demands that it shall authorize the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church; and on this condition he lets its legal spirit pass. We should thus have simply *the juxtaposition* of the two principles which conflicted with one another in the apostolic churches. But, 1. In this attempt at conciliation, the elder son would be completely sacrificed to the younger; for the latter is seated at table in the house, the former is without, and we remain in ignorance as to whether he will re-enter. And this last would represent the apostolic Christianity which founded the Church! 2. Adopting biblical premises, ver. 31 can easily be applied to the Mosaic system faithfully observed, and that, as we have seen, accord-

ing to the view of St. Paul himself. 3. It belonged to the method of progressive transition, which Jesus always observed, to seek to develope within the bosom of the Mosaic dispensation, and without ever attacking it, the new principle which was to succeed it, and the germ of which was already deposited in it. Jesus did not wish to suppress anything which He had not completely replaced and surpassed. He therefore accepted the ancient system, while attaching to it the new. The facts pointed out by Keim are fully explained by this situation.

Holtzmann thinks that our parable, which is not found in Matthew, may really be only an amplification of that of the *two sons*, which is found in that evangelist (Matt. xxi. 28–30). Does not this supposition do too much honour to the alleged amplifier, whether Luke or any other?

6. *The Two Parables on the use of Earthly Goods:* chap. xvi. —Those two remarkable passages are peculiar to Luke, though taken, according to Holtzmann, from the common source *A*, from which Matthew also borrows. For what reason, on this hypothesis, has the latter omitted them? The second espeally (ver. 31: *They have Moses and the prophets*) was perfectly in keeping with the spirit of this Gospel. According to Weizsäcker, the two parables have undergone very grave modifications in the course of successive editions. In his view, the original thought of the parable of the unjust steward was this: Beneficence, the means of justification for injustices committed by him who shows it. In our Gospel, it is intended to promise to the Gentiles an entrance into the kingdom of God, as a recompense for their benefits toward the lawful heirs of the kingdom. The second parable would also belong in origin to the tendency of Ebionite Judeo-Christianity; it would transform into a description the idea of the four beatitudes and four maledictions, which in Luke open the Sermon on the Mount. Later, it became the representation of the rejection of the unbelieving Jews (the wicked rich man and his brethren), and of the salvation of the Gentiles represented by Lazarus (probably a Gentile, according to ver. 21). We shall see if the interpretation justifies suppositions so violent.

This piece contains: 1*st.* The parable of the unjust steward, with accompanying reflections (vers. 1–13); 2*d.* Reflections forming an introduction to the parable of the wicked rich man, and the parable itself (vers. 14–31). Those two portraits are evidently the counterparts of one another. The idea

common to both is that of the relation between the use made of earthly goods and man's future beyond the tomb. The steward represents the owner who is able to secure his future by a wise use of those transitory goods; the wicked rich man, the owner who compromises his future by neglecting this just employment of them.

1*st.* Vers. 1–13. *The Unjust Steward.*—Is there a connection between this lesson on riches and the preceding? The formula ἔλεγε δὲ καί, *and He said also* (ver. 1), seems to indicate that there is. Olshausen supposes that *the disciples* (ver. 1) to whom the parable is addressed are publicans brought back to God, those recent converts of chap. xv., whom Jesus was exhorting to employ wisely the earthly goods which they had acquired unjustly. But the expression: *to His disciples* (ver. 1), refers naturally to the ordinary disciples of our Lord. In the sense of Olshausen, some epithet would require to have been added. The connection is rather in the keeping up of the contrast between the life of faith and pharisaic righteousness. The two chief sins of the Pharisees were pride, with its fruit hypocrisy, and avarice (ver. 14). We see in the Sermon on the Mount, which was directed against their false righteousness, how Jesus passes directly from the one of those sins to the other (Matt. vi. 18, 19). This is precisely what He does here. He had just been stigmatizing pharisaic pride in the person of the elder son. Now this disposition is ordinarily accompanied by that proud hardness which characterizes the wicked rich man, as the heart broken by the experiences of faith is naturally disposed to the liberal actions of the unjust steward. Hence the form: *He said to them also.*

And first the parable: vers. 1–9.[1]—In this portraiture, as in some others, Jesus does not scruple to use the example of the wicked for the purpose of stimulating His disciples. And in fact, in the midst of conduct morally blamable, the wicked often display remarkable qualities of activity, prudence, and perseverance, which may serve to humble and encourage

[1] Ver. 1. ℵ. B. D. L. R. omit αυτου after μαθητας.—Ver. 2. 7 Mjj. omit σου after οικονομιας.—ℵ. B. D. P., δυνη instead of δυνησῃ.—Ver. 4. ℵ. B. D. some Mnn. Syr. add εκ, and L. X. It^{plerique}, Vg., απο before της.—Vers. 6, 7. ℵ. B. D. L., τα γραμματα instead of το γραμμα.—Ver. 9. 8 Mjj. some Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$ It$^{alliq.}$, εκλιπῃ or εκλειπῃ instead of εκλιπητε, which the T. R. reads with ℵ^{ca} F. P. U.

believers. The parable of the unjust steward is the masterpiece of this sort of teaching.

The rich man of ver. 1 is a great lord living in the capital, far from his lands, the administration of which he has committed to a factor. The latter is not a mere slave, as in xii. 42; he is a freeman, and even occupying a somewhat high social position (ver. 3). He enjoys very large powers. He gathers in and sells the produce at his pleasure. Living himself on the revenue of the domain, it is his duty to transmit to his master the surplus of the income. Olshausen alleges that this master, in the view of Jesus, represents the prince of this world, the devil, and that only thus can the eulogium be explained which he passes (ver. 8) on the conduct of his knavish servant. This explanation is incompatible with the deprivation of the steward pronounced by the master, ver. 2, and which, in the view of our Lord, can only denote death. It is not Satan who disposes of human life. Satan is not even the master of riches; does not God say, Hag. ii. 8: "*The silver is mine, and the gold is mine*"? Comp. Ps. xxiv. 1. Finally, it is not to Satan, certainly, that we shall have to give account of our administration of earthly goods! Our Lord clearly gives out Himself as the person represented by the master, vers. 8 and 9: *The master commended . . .; and I also say unto you.* Again, could we admit that in ver. 12 the expression: *faithful in that which is another man's* (your master's), should signify: "faithful to that which the devil has committed to you of his goods"? Meyer has modified this explanation of Olshausen: the master, according to him, is wealth personified, mammon. But how are we to attribute the personal part which the master in the parable plays to this abstract being, wealth? The master can only represent God Himself, Him *who maketh poor and maketh rich, who bringeth low and lifteth up.* In relation to his neighbour, every man may be regarded as the proprietor of his goods; but in relation to God, no one is more than a tenant. This great and simple thought, by destroying the right of property relatively to God, gives it its true basis in the relation between man and man. Every man should respect the property of his neighbour, just *because* it is not the latter's property, but that of God, who has entrusted it to him. In the report made to the master about

the delinquencies of his steward, we are to see the image of that perfect knowledge which God has of all human unfaithfulness. *To waste the goods* of God, means, after having taken out of our revenue what is demanded for our maintenance, instead of consecrating the remainder to the service of God and of His cause, squandering it on our pleasure, or hoarding it up for ourselves. Here we have the judgment of Jesus on that manner of acting which appears to us so natural: it is to forget that we are but stewards, and to act as proprietors.

The saying of the master to the steward (ver. 2) does not include a call to clear himself; it is a sentence of deprivation. His guilt seems thoroughly established. The account which he is summoned to render is the inventory of the property confided to him, to be transmitted to his successor. What corresponds to this deprivation is evidently the event by which God takes away from us the free disposal of the goods which He had entrusted to us here below, that is, death. The *sentence* of deprivation pronounced beforehand denotes the awakening of the human conscience when it is penetrated by this voice of God: "Thou must die; thou shalt give account." Φωνήσας is stronger than καλέσας: "speaking with the tone of a master." In the phrase τί τοῦτο, τί may be taken as an exclamation: "*How* happens it that I hear this!" or interrogatively, with τοῦτο in apposition: "*What* do I hear of thee, to wit *this?*" The accusation which we should expect to follow is understood.—The present δύνῃ, in some Alex., is that of the immediate future.

The words: *he said within himself*, have some relation to those of xv. 17: *when he came to himself.* It is an act of recollection after a life passed in insensibility. The situation of the man is critical. Of the two courses which present themselves to his mind, the first, digging, and the second, begging, are equally intolerable to him, the one physically, the other morally. All at once, after long reflection, he exclaims, as if striking his forehead: I have it! Ἔγνων, *I have come to see* (ver. 4). He starts from the sentence as from a fact which is irrevocable: *when I am put out.* But has he not those goods, which he is soon to hand over to another, in his hands for some time yet? May he not hasten to use them in such a way that he shall get advantage from them

when he shall have them no more, by making sure, for example, of a refuge for the time when he shall be houseless? When man thinks seriously of his approaching death, it is impossible for him not to be alarmed at that deprivation which awaits him, and at the state of nakedness which will follow. Happy if in that hour he can take a firm resolution. For some time yet he has in his hands the goods of his divine Master, which death is about to wrest from him. Will it not be wisdom on his part so to use them during the brief moments when he has them yet at his disposal, that they shall bear interest for him when they shall be his no more?

This steward, who will soon be homeless, knows people who have houses: "Let us then make friends of them; and when I shall be turned to the street, more than one house shall be open to receive me." The debtors, whom he calls to him with this view, are merchants who are in the habit of coming to get their supplies from him, getting credit probably till they have made their own sales, and making their payments afterwards. The Heb. βάτος, the *bath,* contains about 60 pints. The gift of 50 of those *baths* might mount up to the sum of some thousands of francs. The κόρος, *corus* (homer), contains 10 *ephahs;* and the value of 20 *homers* might rise to some hundreds of francs. The difference which the steward makes between the two gifts is remarkable; it contains a proof of discernment. He knows his men, as the saying is, and can calculate the degree of liberality which he must show to each to gain a like result, that is to say, the hospitality he expects to receive from them until it be repaid. Jesus here describes alms in the most piquant form. Does a rich man, for example, tear up the bill of one of his poor debtors? He only does what the steward does here. For if all we have is God's, supposing we lend anything, it is out of *His* property that we have taken it; and if we give it away, it is with *His* goods (*that which is another's,* ver. 12) that we are generous in so acting. Beneficence from this point of view appears as a sort of holy unfaithfulness. By means of it we prudently make for ourselves, like the steward, personal friends, while we use wealth which, strictly speaking, is that of our Master. But differently from the steward, we do so *holily,* because we know

that we are not acting without the knowledge and contrary to the will of the divine Owner, but that, on the other hand, we are entering into His purposes of love, and that he rejoices to see us thus using the goods which he has committed to us with that intention. This unfaithfulness is faithfulness (ver. 12).

The commendation which the master gives the steward (ver. 8) is not absolute. It has a twofold limitation, first in the word τῆς ἀδικίας, "the *unjust* steward," an epithet which he must certainly put in the master's mouth, and then in the explanatory phrase: "because he had done *wisely*." The meaning of the commendation, then, is to this effect: "Undoubtedly a clever man! It is only to be regretted that he has not shown as much probity as prudence." Thus, even though beneficence chiefly profits him who exercises it, God rejoices to see this virtue. And while He has no favour for the miser who hoards *His* goods, or for the egoist who squanders them, He approves the man who disposes of them wisely in view of his eternal future. Weizsäcker holds that the eulogium given by the master should be rejected from the parable. Had he understood it better, he would not have proposed this suppression, which would be a mutilation.

It is with the second part of ver. 8 that the application begins. "*Wisely:* Yes, adds Jesus, it is quite true. For there is more wisdom found among the children of this world in their mode of acting toward the children of the generation to which they belong, than among the children of light in their conduct toward those who belong to theirs." *Αἰών οὗτος, this age* (world); the period of history anterior to the coming of the kingdom of God. *Φῶς*: the domain of the higher life into which Jesus introduces His disciples, and in which the brightness of divine wisdom reigns. Both spheres have their own population, and every inhabitant of the one or the other is surrounded by a certain number of contemporaries like himself, who form his γενεά or *generation*. Those belonging to the first sphere use every means for their own interest, to strengthen the bonds which unite them to their contemporaries of the same stamp. But those of the second neglect this natural measure of prudence. They forget to use God's goods to form bonds of love to the contemporaries who

share their character, and who might one day give them a full recompense, when they themselves shall want everything and these shall have abundance. Ver. 9 finishes the application. The words: *and I also say unto you,* correspond to these: *and the Lord commended* (ver. 8). As in chap. xv. Jesus had identified Himself with the Father who dwells in heaven, so in this saying He identifies Himself with the invisible owner of all things: *and I.* Jesus means: Instead of hoarding up or enjoying,—a course which will profit you nothing when, on the other side of the tomb, you will find yourselves in your turn poor and destitute of everything,—hasten to make for yourselves, with the goods of another (God's), personal friends (ἑαυτοῖς, *to yourselves*), who shall then be bound to you by gratitude, and share with you their well-being. By a course of beneficence, make haste to transform into a bond of love the base metal of which death will soon deprive you. What the steward did in his sphere in relation to people of his own quality, see that you do in yours toward those who belong like you to the world to come. The Alex. reading, ἐκλίπῃ (μαμωνᾶς), would signify: "that when money shall fail you (by the event of death)." The T. R.: ἐκλίπητε, *when ye shall fail,* refers to the cessation of life, embracing privation of everything of which it is made up.

The *friends,* according to Meyer and Ewald, are the angels, who, affected by the alms of the beneficent man, are attached to him, and assist him at the time of his passing into eternity. But according to the parable, the friends can only be men who have been succoured by him on the earth, poor here below, but possessing a share in the everlasting inheritance. What service can they render to the dying disciple? Here is perhaps the most difficult question in the explanation of the parable. Love testified and experienced establishes between beings a strict moral unity. This is clearly seen in the relation between Jesus and men. May not the disciple who reaches heaven without having gained here below the degree of development which is the condition of full communion with God, receive the increase of spiritual life, which is yet wanting to him, by means of those grateful spirits with whom he shared his temporal goods here below? (Comp. Rom. xv. 27 and 1 Cor. ix. 11.) Do we not already see on

the earth the poor Christian, who is assisted by a humane, but in a religious point of view defective, rich man, by his prayers, by the overflowing of his gratitude, and the edification which he affords him, requiting his benefactor infinitely more and better than he receives from him? Almsgiving is thus found to be the most prudent investment; for the communication of love once established by its means, enables him who practises it to enjoy provisionally the benefits of a spiritual state far superior to that which he has himself reached. A similar thought is found in xiv. 13, 14. But if this explanation seems to leave something to desire, we must fall back on sayings such as these: "*He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord.*" "*Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*" It is Jesus, it is God Himself, who become our debtors by the assistance which we grant to those who are the objects of their love. And would such friends be useless in the hour of our dissolution? *To receive.* is not *to introduce.* On the contrary, the first of these two terms assumes that admission is already adjudged. Faith, which alone opens heaven, is supposed in the hearers whom Jesus is addressing in the parable: they are *disciples,* ver. 1. Conversion, the fruit of faith, is equally implied, vers. 3 and 4. And since the disciple whom Jesus describes has chosen believers as the special objects of his liberality, he must to a certain degree be a believer himself.

The poetical expression *eternal habitations* (tents) is borrowed from patriarchal history. The tents of Abraham and Isaac under the oaks of Mamre are transferred in thought to the life to come, which is represented under the image of a glorified Canaan. What is the future of poetry but the past idealized? It is less natural to think, with Meyer, of the tents of Israel in the desert. We may here compare the πολλαὶ μοναί, the *many mansions,* in the Father's house, John xiv. 3.—There remains to be explained the phrase ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας, *the mammon of unrighteousness.* The word μαμωνᾶς is not, as has often been said, the name of an oriental divinity, the god of money. It denotes, in Syriac and Phœnician, money itself (see Bleek on Matt. vi. 24). The Aramaic name is ממון, and, with the article, ממונא. The

epithet *unrighteous* is taken by many commentators simply to mean, that the acquisition of fortune is most frequently tainted with sin; according to Bleek and others, that sin readily attaches to the administration of it. But these are only accidental circumstances; the context points to a more satisfactory explanation. The ear of Jesus must have been constantly offended with that sort of reckless language in which men indulge without scruple: *my* fortune, *my* lands, *my* house. He who felt to the quick man's dependence on God, saw that there was a usurpation in this idea of ownership, a forgetfulness of the true proprietor; on hearing such language, He seemed to see the farmer playing the landlord. It is this sin, of which the natural man is profoundly unconscious, which He lays bare in this whole parable, and which He specially designates by this expression, *the unrighteous mammon.* The two τῆς ἀδικίας, vers. 8 and 9, correspond exactly, and mutually explain one another. It is therefore false to see in this epithet, with De Wette, the Tübingen School, Renan, etc., a condemnation of property *as such.* Man's sin does not consist in being, as one invested with earthly property, the steward of God, but in forgetting that he is so (parable following).

There is no thought more fitted than that of this parable, on the one hand, to undermine the idea of merit belonging to almsgiving (what merit could be got out of that which is *another's?*), and on the other, to encourage us in the practice of that virtue which assures us of friends and protectors for the grave moment of our passing into the world to come. What on the part of the steward was only wise unfaithfulness, becomes wise faithfulness in the servant of Jesus who acts on acquaintance with principle. It dare not be said that Jesus had wit; but if one could be tempted to use the expression at all, it would be here.

Of the many explanations of this parable which have been proposed, we shall merely quote some of the most prominent. Schleiermacher takes the master to be the Roman knights who farmed the taxes of Judæa, and sublet them to needy publicans; the steward, to be the publicans whom Jesus exhorted to expend on their countrymen the goods of which they cleverly cheated those great foreigners. Henri Bauer sees in the

master the Israelitish authorities, and in the unfaithful steward the Judeo-Christians, who, without troubling themselves about theocratic prejudices, should strive to communicate to the Gentiles the benefits of the covenant. According to Weizsäcker, in the original thought of the parable the steward represented a Roman magistrate, who, to the detriment of the Jews, had been guilty of maladministration, but who thereafter strives to make amends by showing them gentleness and liberality. No wonder that from this point of view the critic knows not what to make of the eulogium passed by the master on his steward! But according to him, the sense and the image were transformed, and the description became in the hands of Luke an encouragement to rich and unbelieving Jews to merit heaven by doing good to poor Christians. The arbitrary and forced character of those explanations is clear as the day, and they need no detailed refutation. We are happy that we can agree, at least for once, with Hilgenfeld, both in the general interpretation of the parable and in the explanation of the sayings which follow (*Die Evangel*, p. 199).

Vers. 10–13.[1] "*He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much.* 11. *If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust that which is true?* 12. *And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?* 13. *No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*"—Many regard these reflections as arbitrarily placed here by Luke. But whatever Bleek may say, is it not just the manner in which we constitute ourselves proprietors of our earthly goods, which leads us to make a use of them which is contrary to their true destination? The following piece, therefore, derives its explanation from the parable, and is directly connected with it. Ver. 12 (τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ) would even be unintelligible apart from it.—Ver. 10 is a comparison borrowed from common life. From the experience expressed in the two parallel propositions of this verse, it follows that a master does not think of elevating to a higher position the

[1] Ver. 12. B. L., το ημετερον instead of το υμετερον.

servant who has abused his confidence in matters of less importance. *Faithful* toward the master, *unjust* toward men.

The application of this rule of conduct to believers, vers. 11, 12. The *unrighteous mammon* is *God's* money, which man unjustly takes as *his own.* Faithfulness would have implied, above all, the employment of those goods in the service of God; but our deprivation once pronounced (death), it implies their employment in our interest rightly understood by means of beneficence. Through lack of this fidelity or wisdom, we establish our own incapacity to administer better goods if they were confided to us; therefore God will not commit them to us. Those goods are called τὸ ἀληθινόν, the *true* good, that which corresponds really to the idea of good. The contrast has misled several commentators to give to the word ἄδικος the meaning of *deceitful.* This is to confound the word ἀληθινός with ἀληθής (*veracious*). The real good is that which can in no case be changed to its opposite. It is not so with money, which is at best a provisional good, and may even be a source of evil. This is the application of 10*a*; ver. 12 is that of 10*b*. Earthly goods are called another's *good,* that is to say, a good which strictly belongs to another than ourselves (God). As it is *faithfulness* to God, so it is *justice* to man, to dispose of them with a view to our poor neighbour. *That which is our own* denotes the good for which we are essentially fitted, which is the normal completion of our being, the Divine Spirit become our own spirit by entire assimilation, or in the words of Jesus, *the kingdom prepared for us from the foundation of the world.* Our Lord's thought is therefore this: God commits to man, during his earthly sojourn in the state of probation, goods belonging to Him, which are of less value (earthly things); and the use, faithful or unfaithful, just or unjust, which we make of these settles the question whether our true patrimony (the goods of the Spirit, of which the believer himself receives only the earnest here below) shall or shall not be granted to him above. Like a rich father, who should trust his son with a domain of little value, that he might be trained later in life to manage the whole of his inheritance, thus putting his character to the proof, so God exposes external seeming goods of no value to the thousand abuses of our unskilful admini-

stration here below, that from the use which we make of them there may one day be determined for each of us whether we shall be put in possession, or whether we shall be deprived of our true eternal heritage,—the good which corresponds to our inmost nature. The entire philosophy of our terrestial existence is contained in these words.

Ver. 13, which closes this piece, is still connected with the image of the parable: the steward had *two masters*, whose service he could not succeed in reconciling, the owner of the revenue which he was managing, and money, which he was worshipping.—The two parallel propositions of this verse are usually regarded as identical in meaning, and as differing only in the position assigned to each of the two masters successively as the objects of the two opposite feelings. But Bleek justly observes, that the absence of the article before ἑνός in the second proposition seems to forbid our taking this pronoun as the simple repetition of the preceding τὸν ἕνα in the first; he therefore gives it a more general sense, *the one or the other* of the two preceding, and places the whole difference between the two parallel propositions in the graduated meaning of the different verbs employed, *holding to* being less strong than *loving*, and *despising* less strong than *hating*. Thus: "He will hate the one and love the other; or at least, he will hold more either to the one or other of the two, which will necessarily lead him to neglect the service of the other."—It makes no material difference.—This verse, whatever the same learned critic may say, concludes this discourse perfectly, and forms the transition to the following piece, in which we find a sincere worshipper of Jehovah perishing because he has practically made money his God. The place which this verse occupies in Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 24) is also suitable, but somewhat uncertain, like that of the whole piece of which it forms part.

2*d.* Vers. 14–31. *The Wicked Rich Man.—The introduction* (vers. 14–18) is composed of a series of sayings which at first sight appear to have no connection with one another. Holtzmann thinks that Luke collects here at random sayings scattered throughout the *Logia*, for which till now he had not found any place. But there are only two leading ideas in this introduc-

tion: the rejection of the Pharisees, and the permanence of the law. Now these are precisely the two ideas which are exhibited in action in the following parable: the one in the condemnation of the wicked rich man, that faithful Pharisee ("*father Abraham*," vers. 24, 27, 30); the other in the manner in which Abraham asserts, even in Hades, the imperishable value of the law and the prophets. The relation between these two essential ideas of the introduction and of the parable is this: the law on which the Pharisees staked their credit will nevertheless be the instrument of their eternal condemnation. This is exactly what Jesus says to the Jews, John v. 45: "*There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust.*" It must be confessed, however, that this introduction, vers. 14–18, has a very fragmentary character. It contains the elements of a discourse, rather than the discourse itself. But this very fact proves that St. Luke has not taken the liberty of composing this introduction arbitrarily and independently of his sources. What historian would compose in such a manner? A discourse invented by the evangelist would not have failed to present an evident logical connection, as much as the discourses which Livy or Xenophon put into the mouth of their heroes. The very brokenness suffices to prove that the discourse was really held, and existed previously to this narrative.

Vers. 14 and 15.[1] "*The Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided Him.* 15. *And He said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.*"—The last words of Jesus on the impossibility of combining the service of God and mammon, fell full on the heads of the Pharisees, those pretended servants of Jehovah, who nevertheless in their lives showed themselves such zealous worshippers of riches (Matt. vi., transition between vers. 18, 19). Hence their sneers (ἐκμυκτηρίζειν). The poverty of Jesus Himself was perhaps the theme of their derision: "It is easy to speak of money with such disdain . . . when one is destitute as thou art." In His answer (ver. 15), Jesus gives them to understand that the

[1] Ver. 14. ℵ. B. D. L. R. 3 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It. omit καὶ before οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.—Ver. 15. 11 Mjj. 70 Mnn. omit ἐστιν after θεοῦ.

judgment of God is regulated by another standard than that of the men who are at their side. It is at the heart that God looks; and the reign of a single passion, such as that avarice which devours them, suffices to render odious in His eyes that whole righteousness of outward observances which gains for them the favour of the world. The phrase: *Ye are they which justify yourselves*, signifies, "your business is to pass yourselves off as righteous." The ὅτι, *for*, is explained by the idea of condemnation, which here attaches to that of *knowledge*: "God knows you [and rejects you], for . . ." Ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *on the part of men*, may mean: *among* men, or *in the judgment of* men. In connection with the idea of being highly esteemed, those two ideas are combined. Jesus means: "What men extol and glorify, consequently the ambitious, who, like you, by one means or another push themselves into the front rank, become an object of abomination to God." For all glorification of man rests on falsehood. God alone is great and deserving to be praised.

What had chiefly irritated the Pharisees in the preceding was the spiritual sense in which Jesus understood the law, unveiling under their airs of sanctity the stain of shameful avarice which defiled them. This idea affords the point of connection for what follows (vers. 16–18).

Vers. 16–18.[1] "*The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.* 17. *But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail.* 18. *Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.*"—But, adds Jesus (ver. 16), a new era is beginning, and with it your usurped dominion comes to an end. Since the time of John, that law and those prophets which you have made your pedestal in Israel are replaced by a new dispensation. To the religious aristocracy which you had succeeded in founding there follows a kingdom of God equally open to *every man* (πᾶς); all have access to it as well as you! Βιάζεσθαι should not be taken in the passive sense, as Hilgenfeld would have it: "Every man is constrained by

[1] Ver. 16. ℵ. B. L. R. X. some Mnn., μεχρι instead of ως before Ιωαννου. — Ver. 18. B. D. L. some Mnn. It. Vg. omit πας between και and ο.

the gospel," but as a middle, in the sense of *to hasten*, to throw themselves. There is, as it were, a dense crowd pressing through the gate which is now open, and every one, even the lowest of the publicans, is free to enter. Recall here the parables of chap. xv. But while this repentant crowd penetrates into the kingdom (vii. 29), the Pharisees and scribes remain without, like the elder son in the preceding parable. Let them beware, however! That legal system on which they have founded their throne in Israel is about to crumble to pieces (ver. 16); while the law itself, which they violate at the very moment they make it their boast, shall remain as the eternal expression of divine holiness, and as the dreadful standard by which they shall be judged (ver. 17). The δέ is adversative: *but*. It indicates the contrast between the end of the legal economy and the permanence of the law. This contrast reminds us of the antitheses of Matt. v., of which this saying is a sort of summary: "*Ye have heard that it was said . . . ; but I say unto you . . .*" Jesus only abolishes the law by fulfilling it and confirming it spiritually.—Κεραία, diminutive of κέρας, *horn*, denotes the small lines or hooks of the Hebrew letters. The least element of divine holiness which the law contains has more reality and durability than the whole visible universe.

The two verses, 16 and 17, are put by Matthew in the discourse of Jesus regarding John the Baptist, xi. 12, 13, inversely in point of order. We can easily understand how the mention of John the Baptist, ver. 16, led Matthew to insert this saying in the discourse which Jesus pronounced on His forerunner. We have seen that in that same discourse, as given by Luke (chap. vii.), this declaration was with great advantage replaced by a somewhat different saying, vers. 29, 30; and if, as Bleek owns (i. p. 454 et seq.), Luke decidedly deserves the preference as to the tenor of the words, it will doubtless be the same as to the place which he assigns them; for it is in general on this second point that his superiority appears.

Ver. 18. Not only in spite of the abolition of the legal form will the law continue in its substance; but if this substance even comes to be modified in the new economy, it will be in the direction of still greater severity. Jesus gives as an

example the law of divorce. This same idea meets us, Matt. v. 31, 32; it tallies fully with the meaning of the declaration, Matt. xix. 3 et seq., Mark x. 2 et seq., which was uttered in this same journey, and almost at the same period. Jesus explains to the same class of hearers as in our passage, to the Pharisees namely, that if Moses authorized divorce, merely confining himself to guard it by some restrictions, there was a forsaking for a time of the true moral point of view already proclaimed Gen. ii., and which He, Jesus, came to re-establish in its purity. Luke and Matthew do not speak of the case of voluntary separation on the part of the *woman* referred to by Mark (x. 12) and Paul (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11). And Paul does not expressly interdict the divorced *man*, as Mark does, from contracting a second marriage. Those shades in such a precept cannot be voluntary; they represent natural variations due to tradition (Syn.) or to the nature of the context (Paul). —The parallels quoted leave no doubt as to the real connection of ver. 18 with ver. 17. The *asyndeton* between those two verses is explained by the fragmentary character of Luke's report. What remains to us of this discourse resembles the peaks of a mountain chain, the base of which is concealed from view, and must be reconstructed by reflection. As to the compiler, he has evidently refrained from filling up at his own hand the blanks in his document. The disjointed character of this account has been turned into an accusation against him; but it ought rather to be regarded as a proof of his conscientious fidelity.

Does the context, as we have just established it, leave anything to be desired? Has Holtzmann ground for regarding this piece as a collection of sentences thrown together at random? Or is it necessary, in order to justify ver. 18, to regard it, with Schleiermacher, as an allusion to the divorce of Herod Antipas from the daughter of Aretas, and his unlawful marriage with Herodias,—a crime which the scribes and Pharisees had not the courage to condemn like John the Baptist? Or, finally, must we, with Olshausen, take the idea of divorce in a spiritual sense, and apply it to the emancipation of believers from the yoke of the law, agreeably to Rom. vii. 1 et seq.? No; the explanation which we have given, as well as the authenticity of the context, appear to be sufficiently established by the parallels quoted (Matt. v. 18, 19 and 31, 32, xix. 3 et seq.; Mark x. 2 et seq.).

The saying of ver. 17, proclaiming the eternal duration of the law,

has appeared to some critics incompatible with the *Pauline* character of Luke's Gospel. Hilgenfeld alleges that the canonical text of Luke is falsified, and that the true original form of this passage, as well as of many others, has been preserved by Marcion, who reads: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle *of my sayings* to fail." But, 1. The manifest incompatibility of our canonical text with Marcion's system renders it, on the contrary, very probable that it was Marcion who in this case, as in so many others, accommodated the text to his dogmatic point of view. 2. Could Jesus have applied the word *tittle* to *His own* sayings before they had been expressed in writing? 3. The parallel, Matt. v. 18, proves that the expression in its original meaning really applied to the law. If such was the primary application in the mind of Jesus, would it not be extremely surprising if, after an earlier Luke had departed from it, the more modern Luke should have reverted to it? Besides, this supposition, combated by Zeller, is withdrawn by Volkmar, who first gave it forth (*Die Evangel*, p. 481). Zeller, however, supposes that the evangelist, feeling the anti-Pauline tendency of this saying, designedly enclosed it between two others, intended to show the reader that it was not to be taken in its literal sense. But would it not have been far simpler to omit it altogether? And does not so much artifice contrast with the simplicity of our Gospels?

According to the Talmud, Tract. *Gittin* (ix. 10), Hillel, the grandfather of Gamaliel, the man whom our moderns would adopt as the master of Jesus Christ, taught that the husband is entitled to put away his wife when she burns his dinner.[1] We can understand how, in view of such pharisaic teachings, Jesus felt the need of protesting, not only by affirming the maintenance of moral obligation as contained in the law, but even by announcing that the new doctrine would in this respect exceed the severity of the old, and would conclusively raise the moral obligation to the height of the ideal. The declaration of Jesus, ver. 17, about the maintenance of the law, is, besides, perfectly at one with St. Paul's view (1 Cor. vii. 19): "The keeping of the *commandments of God* is everything;" comp. Rom. ii. 12: "As many as have sinned under the law, *shall be judged by the law.*"

On the basis of this introduction, announcing to the Pharisees the end of their paraded show of righteousness and the advent of real holiness, there rises by way of *example* the following parable. To the words of ver. 15, *that which is highly esteemed among men*, there corresponds the representation of the sumptuous and brilliant life of the rich man; to the predicate, *is an abomination in the sight of God* (same verse), the description of his punishment in Hades; to the declaration

[1] *Jesus und Hillel*, 1867, by Delitzsch, p. 27, where an answer is given to the forced interpretation which modern Jews give of this saying.

of ver. 17 regarding the permanence of the law, the reply of Abraham: *they have Moses and the prophets.*

Vers. 19–31. *The Parable of the Wicked Rich Man.*—It is composed of two principal scenes, which correspond so exactly with one another, that in their correspondence we must seek the very idea of the parable; these are, the scene on the earth (vers. 19–22), and that in Hades (vers. 23–31).

The terrestrial scene, vers. 19–22.[1] It embraces four portraitures which, taken two and two, form counterparts of one another: the life of the rich man, ver. 19, and that of the poor man, vers. 20, 21; then the death of the former, ver. 22*a*, and that of the latter, ver. 22*b*. The description of the rich man's life presents two prominent features: the magnificence of his dress,—*πορφύρα*, the upper dress, a woollen garment dyed purple, and *βυσσός*, the under garment, a tunic of fine linen; next, the sumptuousness of his habitual style of living,—a splendid banquet daily. This description of the life of the rich of that day applied to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles. Nay, among the former, who sometimes regarded wealth as a sign of divine blessing, the enjoyments of that privileged state must have been indulged with so much the less scruple; so the Pharisees in particular seem to have done (xx. 46, 47).—After the rich man, who first claims attention, our eyes are carried to the unhappy man laid at the entrance of his house, vers. 20 and 21. The Greek name *Lazarus* does not come, as some have thought, from *Lo-ezer, no help*, but from *El-ezer, God helps;* whence the form Eleazar, abbreviated by the Rabbins into *Leazar;* and hence Lazarus. This name, according to John xi., was common among the Jews. As this is the only case in which Jesus designates one of the personages of a parable by his name, this peculiarity must have a significance in the account. It is intended, doubtless, as the name so often was among the Jews, to describe the character of him who bears it. By this name, then, Jesus makes this personage the representation of that class of the Israelitish people which formed the opposite extreme of pharisaism—poor ones whose confidence was in God alone, the *Aniim* of the O. T., the pious indigent.

[1] Ver. 20. ℵ. B..D. L. X. omit *ην* after *τις* and *ος* before *εβεβλητο*.—Ver. 21. ℵ. B. L. It^{aliq}. omit *των ψιχιων*.

The gateway at the entrance of which he was laid is that which conducts in Eastern houses from the outside to the first court. The word ἐβέβλητο, *was thrown*, expresses the heedlessness with which he was laid down there and abandoned to the care of those who were constantly going and coming about this great house.—The *crumbs* denote the remains of the meal which the servants would sometimes throw to him, but which were not enough to satisfy him. The omission of the words τῶν ψιχίων by some Alex. arises from the confusion of the two τῶν by an ancient copyist; these words are wrongly rejected by Tischendorf; they are to be preserved as the counterpart of the *drop of water*, ver. 24. The nakedness of the poor man contrasts with the rich man's elaborate toilet, as those crumbs do with his banquets. The words ἀλλὰ καί, *moreover*, which indicate a higher degree of endurance, forbid us to regard the feature of the dogs licking the sores of Lazarus as an alleviation of his miseries. Besides, this animal is never represented in the Bible, nor among the Orientals in general, in a favourable light. The licking of the poor man's unbandaged wounds by those unclean animals as they passed, is the last stroke of the picture of his nakedness and forsakenness.

To the contrast between the two lives there soon succeeds that between the two deaths, ver. 22, which introduces the contrast between the two states in the life to come. Lazarus dies first, exhausted by privations and sufferings. That very moment he finds in the heavenly world the sympathy which was refused to him here below. In Jewish theology, the angels are charged with receiving the souls of pious Israelites, and transporting them to that portion of Hades which is reserved for them. *Abraham's bosom*, a figure also common among the Rabbins, denotes either intimate communion in general (John i. 18), or more specially the place of honour at a feast (John xiii. 23); this is naturally assigned to the newly-arrived stranger, all the more that his earthly sufferings demand a rich compensation. Abraham presides at the feast until the Messiah comes to take the first place, and the feast of the kingdom begins (xiii. 25). Meyer concludes, from the fact that the interment of Lazarus is not mentioned, and from the object αὐτόν, *him*, that he was transported *body and soul* to Abraham's bosom. But so early as in the *Targum* of Can-

ticles, we find the distinction between body and soul: "The righteous whose *souls* are carried by angels to paradise." The pronoun *αὐτόν* thus designates only his true self, the soul.—The burial of Lazarus is not mentioned, for it took place without ceremony, or perhaps not at all. The body, claimed by no one, was thrown to the dunghill. The contrast to the rich man is evident. No angels to transport his soul; but for his body, on the contrary, a splendid funeral procession.

What is the crime in the life of this rich man which accounts for the terrible condition described in the following scene? From the fact that it is not mentioned, the conclusion has been drawn that it must be simply his riches. The Tübingen School says: he is condemned *as being rich*, and Lazarus is saved *as being poor*. And M. Renan thinks that the parable should be entitled, not the parable *of the wicked rich man*, but merely *of the rich man*. Here, it is said, we meet again with the Ebionite heresy of Luke (De Wette). But how has it escaped observation, that if no crime properly so called is laid to the charge of the rich man, his misdeed is nevertheless clearly indicated? and it is no other than the very existence of this poor man laid at his gate in destitution, without any relief being brought to his wants. Such is the *corpus delicti*. The crime of the life described ver. 19, is the fact referred to vers. 20 and 21. Every social contrast between the more and the less, either in respect of fortune, or strength, or acquirement, or even piety, is permitted and willed by God only with a view to its being neutralized by man's free agency. This is a task assigned from on high, the means of forming those bonds of love which are our treasure in heaven (xii. 33, 34). To neglect this offer is to procure for oneself an analogous contrast in the other life,—a contrast which *shall be capable* of being sweetened for us no more than we have ourselves sweetened it in the life below.—It would be hard to understand how, if wealth *as such* were the rich man's sin, the celestial banquet could be presided over by Abraham, the richest of the rich in Israel. As to Lazarus, the real cause of the welcome which he finds in the world to come is not his poverty, but that which is already pointed out by his name: *God is my help*.

The scene from beyond the tomb, vers. 23–31, offers a con-

trast exactly corresponding to the terrestrial scene. We do not attempt to distinguish in the representation what should be taken in a figurative sense and what strictly. The realities of the spiritual world can only be expressed by figures; but, as has been said, those figures are the figures of something. The colours are almost all borrowed from the palette of the Rabbins; but the thought which clothes itself in those figures that it may become palpable, is, as we shall see, the original and personal thought of Jesus.—Of the two interviews forming this scene, the first relates to the rich man's lot (vers. 23–26), the second to that of his brethren (vers. 27–31).

Vers. 23–26.[1] After the short sleep of death, what an awakening! The idea of suffering does not lie in the words ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ, which our versions render by: *in hell*. *Sheol* (Heb.), *Hades* (Gr.), the *Inferi* or *infernal regions* (Lat.), simply denote the abode of the dead, without distinguishing the different conditions which it may include, in opposition to the *land of the living*. *Paradise* (xxiii. 43) as well as *Gehenna* (xii. 5) forms part of it. Hence, also, from the midst of his punishment the rich man can behold Abraham and Lazarus. The notion of pain is actually found only in the words: *being in torments*.—On Abraham in the abode of the dead, comp. John viii. 56, where Jesus speaks without figure.—The plural τοῖς κόλποις, substituted for the singular (ver. 22), denotes fulness; a whole region is meant where a company is gathered together.—The situation, ver. 24 et seq., is very similar to that of the dialogues of the dead found in the ancients, and particularly in the Rabbins. Φωνήσας, *calling in a loud voice*, corresponds to μακρόθεν, *afar off*, ver. 23. Nothing more severe for those Pharisees, who made a genealogical tree the foundation of their salvation, than this address put into the mouth of the poor condemned man: *Father Abraham!* "All the circumcised are safe," said the Rabbins; therefore, was not circumcised equivalent to son of Abraham? In this situation, there arises in the mind of the rich man a thought which had never occurred to him while he was on the earth, namely,

[1] Ver. 25. 7 Mjj. 30 Mnn. Vss. omit σὺ after ἀπέλαβες.—Instead of ὧδε (T. R. with some Mnn.), all the documents: ὧδε. — Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L. It^{plerique}, ἐν instead of ἐκ before πρὸς.—Instead of ἐντεῦθεν (T. R. with K. Π. some Mnn.), all the documents, ἔνθεν.—ℵ. B. D. omit οἱ before ἐκεῖθεν.

that the contrast between abundance and destitution may have its utility for him who is in want. He expresses his discovery with a simplicity in which shamelessness disputes the palm with innocence. The gen. ὕδατος with βάπτειν: to drop *water;* this expression denotes water falling drop by drop from the finger which has been immersed in it; it thus corresponds to the word *crumbs,* ver. 21.

On *flame,* comp. Mark ix. 43–48, 49. Lustful desires, inflamed and fed by boundless gratification, change into torture for the soul as soon as it is deprived of the external objects which correspond to them, and from the body by which it communicates with them.—The address: *my son,* in the mouth of Abraham, is more poignant still than that of: *Father Abraham* in that of the rich man. Abraham acknowledges the reality of the civil state appealed to, and yet this man is and remains in Gehenna!—The word *remember* is the central one of the parable; for it forms the bond between the two scenes, that of the earth and that of Hades. "Recall the contrast which thou didst leave unbroken on the earth . . ., and thou shalt understand that the present corresponding contrast cannot be alleviated without injustice. Thou hast let the time pass for making Lazarus thy friend (xvi. 8, 9); he can now do nothing for thee." In ἀπέλαβες, *thou receivedst,* there is, as in the ἀπέχειν, Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16, the notion of receiving by appropriating greedily for the purpose of enjoyment. The selfish appropriation of goods was not tempered in him by the free munificence of love. He thought only of draining to the very bottom the cup of pleasure which was at his lips. The same idea is expressed by the pronoun σοῦ added to ἀγαθά, "*thy* good things;" this qualification is not added to κακά, in the second clause; Abraham says simply: "evil things." God trains the human soul by joys and by sorrows. The education of every soul demands a certain sum of both. This thought forms the foundation of ver. 25. It refers exclusively to the pedagogical economy here below or in the world above. The words *comforted* and *tormented* are not the equivalents of *saved* and *damned,* absolutely taken. Nothing could be final among the members of the ancient covenant till they had been brought into contact with Jesus Christ. "The gospel," says St. Peter (1 Ep. iv. 6), "was preached to them

that are dead, *that* they might be [capable of being] judged." The knowledge of Jesus Christ is the condition on which the pronouncing of the final sentence on every soul is based. The hour of this judgment has not yet struck for the rich man. Consequently this verse neither teaches *salvation* by poverty nor *damnation* by riches; ὧδε, *here*, which is read by all the Mjj., is preferable to ὅδε, *he*. *Here* is opposed to: *in his lifetime*.

Ver. 26. But even supposing that some concession might be made in respect of justice, there is another reason which cuts off all hope — *the impossibility of the thing*. The Rabbins represent the two parts of Hades as separated by a wall; Jesus here substitutes a gulf, a figure which agrees better with the entire description. It is the emblem of God's inflexible decree. Only from the fact that this gulf cannot be crossed *at present*, it does not follow that it may not be so one day by means of a bridge offered to repentant Jews (comp. Matt. xii. 32). The omission of οἱ before ἐκεῖθεν, by the Alex., identifies those who pass with those who repass.

Vers. 27–31.[1] *The second Conversation.*—The rich man acquiesces so far as his own person is concerned. But he intercedes for his brethren still in life. And again it is Lazarus who must busy himself on their behalf!—What is the thought contained in this conclusion? Starting from the standpoint that the idea of the parable is the condemnation of wealth, De Wette, the Tübingen School, and Weizsäcker himself find this last part entirely out of keeping with the rest of the description. For it is their impenitence face to face with the law and the prophets which exposes the five brethren to danger, and not their being rich men. They allege, therefore, that Luke at his own hand has added this conclusion, with the view of transforming a doctrine which was originally *Ebionite* and Judeo-Christian into one anti-Judaic or Pauline. The rich man who, in the original meaning of the similitude, simply represented riches, becomes in this conclusion the type of Jewish unbelief in respect of the resurrection of Jesus. Weizsäcker goes the length of regarding Lazarus as the representative of the Gentiles despised by the Jews. This last idea is incompatible with the Jewish name *Lazarus*, as well as with the place awarded to him in Abraham's bosom, the

[1] Ver. 29. ℵ. B. L. omit αὐτῷ after λέγει or λέγει δέ.

gathering place of pious *Jews*. As to the rich man, from the beginning he represents not the rich in general, but the rich man hardened by well-being, the *Pharisee*, whose heart, puffed up with pride, is closed to sympathy with the suffering. This appears from the expressions: *Father Abraham, my son*, vers. 24, 25, which are as it were the motto of Israelitish formalism (Matt. iii. 7–9; John viii. 39). This conclusion is thus nothing else than *the practical application* of the parable, which, instead of being presented to his hearers in the form of an abstract lesson, is given as the continuation of the scene itself. It is exactly the same in the parable of the prodigal son, in which the elder son exhibits the Pharisees with their murmurings, and the divine answer. The first portrait, vers. 19–21, depicted the *sin* of the rich man; the second, vers. 22–26, his *punishment*. In this appendix Jesus unveils to His hearers the *cause* of this misery, the absence of *μετάνοια, repentance*, and for those who wished to profit by the warning, the *means* of preventing the lot which threatens them at the moment of their death: taking to heart Moses and the prophets very differently from what they have ever done. There must pass within them what took place in the prodigal son, the figure of the publicans (xv. 17: *he came to himself*), and in the steward, the type of the new believers (xvi. 3: *he said within himself*): that act of solemn self-examination in which the heart is broken at the thought of its sins, and which impresses an entirely new direction on the life, and on the employment of earthly goods in particular. To reject this conclusion is therefore to break the arrow-point shot by the hand of Jesus at the consciences of His hearers.

Ver. 27. The *five brethren* cannot represent the rich of this world in general, and as little the Jews who remained unbelieving in respect of Jesus Christ. They are Jews living in a privileged, brilliant condition, like that of the rich man—the Pharisees, whom this man represented; this relation is *the idea* expressed by the image of the kinship which connects them. Some have imagined that those five brethren are the five sons of the high priest Annas. Would Jesus have condescended to such personalities? The forms of address: *father*, ver. 27, *father Abraham*, ver. 30, continue to define the meaning of this principal personage very clearly. *Δια-*

μαρτύρεσθαι, ver. 28, does not signify only: to declare, but to testify in such a way that the truth pierces through the wrappings of a hardened conscience (διά). In putting this request into the rich man's mouth, Jesus undoubtedly alludes to that thirst for miracles, for extraordinary and palpable manifestations, which He never failed to meet among His adversaries, and which He refused to satisfy. Such demands charge with insufficiency the means of repentance which God had all along placed in Israel. Some commentators, unable to allow any good feeling in one damned, have attributed this prayer of the rich man to a selfish aim. According to them, he dreaded the time when his own sufferings would be aggravated by seeing those of his brethren. But would not even this fear still suppose in him a remnant of love? And why represent him as destitute of all human feeling? He is not yet, we have seen, *damned* in the absolute sense of the word. If we must seek a selfish alloy in this prayer, it can only be the desire to excuse himself, by giving it to be understood, that if he had been sufficiently warned he would not have been where he is.

Abraham teaches *all his sons* by his reply, ver. 29, with what earnestness they should henceforth *listen* to the reading of that law and those prophets, the latter of which they had, up till now, heard or even studied in vain (John v. 38, 39). The subject has nothing to do with unbelief regarding Jesus; the situation of this saying is purely Jewish.—The rich man insists. His answer, *Nay, father Abraham*, ver. 30, depicts the Rabbinical spirit of disputation and pharisaic effrontery. Repentance would produce, he fully acknowledges, a life wholly different from his own (such as it has been described, ver. 19); but the law without miracles would not suffice to produce this state of mind.—Jesus unveils, ver. 31, the complete illusion belonging to this idea of conversion by means of great miraculous interpositions. He whom the law and the prophets bring not to the conviction of his sins, will be as little led to it by the sight even of one raised from the dead. After the first emotion of astonishment and terror, criticism will awake saying, Hallucination! and carnal security, shaken for a moment, will reassert itself. Jesus not having showed Himself, and not having preached to the Jews after His resurrection, this

saying cannot be an invention of Luke borrowed from that event.

Such is the terrible answer of Jesus to the derision of His adversaries, the proud and covetous Pharisees, ver. 14. He shows them their portrait, the likeness of their present life, and their lot after death. Now they know what they are in the eyes of God (19–21), and what awaits them (23–35); they know also the real cause of their near perdition, and the only means which can yet avert it (27–31).

From this study it follows: 1. That all the indications of the preface (vers. 14–18) are entirely justified; in particular, that the Φαρισαῖοι (*the Pharisees*), ver. 14, is the real key of the parable. 2. That there reigns throughout this description a perfect unity of idea, and that the context furnishes no well-founded reason for distinguishing between an original parable and a later re-handling. 3. That the piece as a whole, and all its details, are in direct correspondence with the historical situation in which Jesus was teaching, and find their natural explanation without any need of having recourse to the later circumstances of apostolic times. 4. That this passage furnishes no proof of an Ebionite document anterior to our Gospel, and forming one of the essential materials employed by the author. Hilgenfeld says (*Die Evangel.* p. 102): "*Nowhere* does our Gospel allow us to distinguish so clearly the original writing of which it is the anti-Jewish and Pauline handling." Nowhere so clearly! This passage proving nothing, it follows that the others prove less than nothing.

This character, not anti-Jewish, but certainly anti-pharisaic, belongs equally to the whole series of pieces which we have just surveyed (comp. xi. 37–xii. 12); then (after an interruption), xiii. 10–31, xiv. 1, xv. 2, xvi. 14. The parable of the unfaithful steward is also connected with this series by the law of contrast. Here, then, is the time of the most intense struggle between Jesus and pharisaism in Galilee, like the contemporaneous period, John vii.–x., in Judæa.

7. *Various Sayings:* xvii. 1–10. — This piece contains four brief lessons, placed here without introduction, and between which it is impossible to establish a connection. Olshausen and Meyer have attempted to connect them with one another and with what precedes. The *offence*, vers. 1 and 2, according to them, is either that which the rich man gave to his brethren, or that which the Pharisees gave to weak believers, by preventing them from declaring themselves for Christ. But how is the expression, *one of these little ones* (ver. 2), applicable to the rich man's brethren? And in the

second sense, should not the warning be addressed to the adversaries rather than *unto the disciples* (ver. 1)?—The teaching regarding *pardon* (vers. 3, 4) is taken to refer to the arrogant harshness of the Pharisees, who did not allow the publicans to appropriate the pardon of sins (the offence, vers. 1, 2); or rancour is regarded as one of those offences of which we must beware; or, finally, a climax is supposed: it is not enough not to do evil to others (vers. 1, 2); we should also pardon the evil which they do to us (vers. 3 and 4). These connections, more or less ingenious, are artificial; they are like those by which one succeeds in tagging together given rhymes.—The petition of the apostles (vers. 5 and 6) is held to find its occasion in the feeling of their powerlessness to pardon. But in this sense, Jesus should have spoken in His reply, not of the faith which works external miracles, but of that which works by love. Lastly, the doctrine taught of the non-meritoriousness of works (vers. 7–10) is alleged to be introduced by this idea, that the greatest miracles wrought by faith confer no merit on man. But how could miracles of faith be described as διαταχθέντα, *things commanded?*—De Wette is therefore right in declining to find a connection between those different sayings. Let us add that several of them are placed by Matthew and Mark in historical circumstances, where they have their entire appropriateness. We shall be able to state the critical result when we come to sum up.

Vers. 1 and 2.[1] *Offences.*—"*Then said He unto the disciples, It is impossible but that offences* (*scandals*) *will come: but woe unto him through whom they come! 2. It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones. Take heed to yourselves.*"—The formula εἶπε δέ, *then said He* (aor.), has not the same weight as the ἔλεγε δέ, *He was saying to them*, the significance of which in Luke we have often remarked. It is the simple historical fact.—'Ανεκδεκτόν, *inadmissible.*

[1] Ver. 1. 9 Mjj. 25 Mnn. Vss. omit αὐτου after μαθητας.—T. R., with some Mnn., only omits του before σκανδαλα.—ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$, πλην ουαι instead of ουαι δε.—Ver. 2. It^{plerique}, ει ουκ εγεννηθη ο λιθος . . . Marcion appears to have read thus; Clem. Rom. perhaps.—ℵ. B. D. L. 20 Mnn. It. Vg., λιθος μυλικος instead of μυλος ονικος.

The absence of offences is a supposition which cannot be admitted in the sinful state in which the world is plunged. The determining particle τοῦ is authentic.—The form, (*the*) offences (τά), denotes the entire category of facts of this kind. The reading μύλος ὀνικός, a millstone moved by an ass, is undoubtedly borrowed from Matthew; we must adopt, with the Alex., λίθος μυλικός, a millstone of smaller dimensions, moved by the hand (ver. 35).—The punishment to which ver. 2 alludes was usual among many ancient peoples, and is so still in the East. The reading of several copies of the *Itala*, which is also found in Marcion, "It were better for him *that he had never been born*, or that a stone . . .," arises, no doubt, from an ancient gloss taken from Matt. xxvi. 24. This is confirmed by the fact that Clemens Romanus combines in his 1 Cor. 46 the two passages, Matt. xviii. 6, 7 (parallel to ours) and Matt. xxvi. 24.—The *little ones* are beginners in the faith.—The final warning, *Take heed* . . ., is occasioned, on the one hand, by the extreme facility of causing offence (ver. 1); on the other, by the terrible danger to which it exposes him who causes it (ver. 2). The lost soul, like an eternal burden, is bound to him who has dragged it into evil, and in turn drags him into the abyss.

The same warning is found Matt. xviii. 6 and Mark ix. 42. The offence which gave rise to it may be in this context, either that which the disciples had given one another in the strife which had taken place between them, or that which they had caused to the man in whom faith had just dawned (*one of these little ones*), and who was manifesting it by curing the possessed. Luke evidently did not *know* this connection; for he would not have failed to indicate it,—he who seeks out historical situations with so much care. Had he not, besides, himself mentioned those two facts (ix. 46–50), and might he not have connected this admonition with them as Mark does? Luke, therefore, did not possess this original Mark, which Holtzmann regards as one of his principal sources; otherwise he would not have detached this saying from the fact which gave rise to it. But the account given by Matthew and Mark proves the truth of Luke's introduction, "He said *unto the disciples*," and the accuracy of the document from which he derived this precept.

Vers. 3 and 4.[1] *The Pardon of Trespasses.*—"*If thy brother*

[1] Ver. 3. 5 Mjj. some Mnn. Vss. omit δι after ἐαν.—א. A. B. L. It^{plerique}, omit εἰς σε after ἁμαρτη (words taken, perhaps, from ver. 4 or from Matt. xviii. 15).—Ver. 4. א. B. D. L. X. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit της ημερας.—Instead of επι σε,

trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. 4. *And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him.*"—Holiness and love meet together in this precept: holiness begins with rebuking; then, when the rebuke has once been taken, love pardons. The pardon to be granted to our brethren has no other limit than their repenting, and the confession by which it is expressed.

Matthew (xviii. 15–22) places this precept in the same discourse as the preceding; it probably referred also to the altercation which had taken place between the disciples on that occasion. But there what gives rise to it is a characteristic question of Peter, which Luke did not know; otherwise he would not have omitted it; comp. xii. 41, where he carefully mentions a similar question put by the same apostle. Mark omits this precept about pardon; but at the end of the same discourse we find this remarkable exhortation (ix. 50): "*Have salt in yourselves* (use severity toward yourselves; comp. v. 43–48), *and have peace with one another*,"—a saying which has substantially the same meaning as our precept on the subject of pardon. What a proof both of the radical authenticity of the sayings of Jesus and of the fragmentary manner in which tradition had preserved them, as well as of the diversity of the sources from which our evangelists derived them!

Vers. 5 and 6.[1] *Faith.*—"*And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith.* 6. *And the Lord said, If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you.*"—This request of the disciples must have been called forth by some manifestation of the extraordinary power of Jesus, with which Luke was unacquainted. —The literal force of the word which the disciples use, "*Add to our faith*," assumes that they think they have some. Jesus does not deny it; but He reduces this having to the feeblest imaginable quantity, since the smallest organic body is too large as an emblem of it.—The only real power in the universe is the divine will. The human will, which has discovered the secret of blending with this force of forces, is raised, in virtue of this union, to omnipotence; and from the time it becomes conscious of this privilege, it acts without obstruction, even in

which T. R., with some Mnn., reads, 7 Mjj. read προς σε. 12 Mjj. 125 Mnn. Ital[liq]. omit all government.

[1] Ver. 6. ℵ. D. L. X. omit ταυτη.

the domain of nature, if the kingdom of God so requires. Perhaps the sycamine to which Jesus points is, in His view, the emblem of the kingdom of God, and the *sea* (here the shore, the pure sand) that of the heathen world, that, till now, barren soil in which, by the faith and the prayers of the disciples, the divine work is henceforth to be planted and to prosper.

Matthew twice presents a saying similar to that of ver. 6, and both times in a definite situation; first, after the healing of the lunatic son, and in contrast to the apostles' lack of faith (xvii. 20, 21). Only in the two cases it is a *mountain* which is to be cast into the sea. Mark, who in narrating the cursing of the fig-tree shows himself the most accurately informed, there reproduces this parable almost in the same way as Matthew; only he prefaces it with the words, "*Have faith in God,*" and connects with it an exhortation to pardon as the condition of prayer being heard. No doubt, owing to the proverbial character of this saying, it may have been frequently repeated. But there is a very remarkable dovetailing between Luke and the two others, Mark especially. Do not the words of Jesus in Mark, *Have faith in God and . . .*, perfectly explain the prayer of the apostles in Luke, *Increase our faith?* Here, as at xii. 41 (comp. with Mark xiii. 37), the one evangelist has preserved one part of the conversation, the other another. With a common written source, is that intelligible? As to the admonition regarding pardon, which in Mark follows this exhortation to faith (xi. 24, 25), it sustains to the question of Peter (Matt. xviii. 21), and the exhortation in Luke (vers. 3, 4), a relation similar to that which we have just observed between Luke xii. 41 and Mark xiii. 37. They are fragments of one whole, the grouping of which it is not difficult to restore.

Vers. 7–10.[1] *The Non-meritoriousness of Works.*—"*But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat?* 8. *And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?* 9. *Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not.* 10. *So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.*"—This saying, which has no connection with what

[1] Ver. 7. ℵ. B. D. L. X. 15 Mnn. Vss. add αυτω after ερει.—Ver. 9. 6 Mjj. It^{alliq}. omit εκεινω after δουλω.—17 Mjj. 130 Mnn. omit αυτω.—ℵ. B. L. X. 6 Mnn. It^{alliq}. omit ου δοκω.—Ver. 10. The Mss. are divided between ωφιλομεν and οφειλομεν.

immediately precedes, does not the less admirably close this series of exhortations given by Jesus, which almost all relate to pharisaism; it is peculiar to Luke. A slave returns in the evening, after having laboured all day in the fields. Does the master give himself up to extraordinary demonstrations of pleasure? No; everything goes on in the house according to the established order. From the work of the day, the servant simply passes to that of the evening; he dresses the viands, and serves at table as long (ἕως, or better still, ἕως ἄν) as his master pleases to eat and drink. And only then may he himself take his meal. So the most irreproachable of men must say to himself that he has done nothing but pay his debt to God; does not God on His side provide for all his wants? From the standpoint of right, they are quits on both sides. The word ἀχρεῖος, *unprofitable*, here signifies: *one who has rendered no service* (beyond what was due). This estimation of human work is true in the sphere of *right* where pharisaism plants itself, and it crushes this system in the dust by denying, along with all human *merit*, all *obligation* on God's part to recompense man; and this estimate should remain that of every man when he values his work in the presence of God. But there is a sphere higher than that of right, that of *love;* and in this latter another labour on man's part, that of joyful devotion, and another estimate on God's part, that of the love which is rejoiced by love. Jesus has described this other point of view, xii. 36, 37. Holtzmann thinks it impossible that this exhortation should have been addressed *to the disciples* (ver. 1). But is not the pharisaic tendency ever ready to spring up again in the hearts of believers? and does it not cling like a gnawing worm to fidelity itself? The words: *I trow not*, are mistakenly rejected by the Alex. Perhaps the οὐ δοκῶ has been confounded with the οὕτω which follows.

How are we to explain the position of those four exhortations in our Gospel, and their juxtaposition, without any logical bond? According to Holtzmann,[1] Luke is about to return to his great historical source, the proto-Mark, which he had left since ix. 51 to work the collection of discourses, the *Logia* (comp. xviii. 15, where the narrative of Luke begins again to move parallel to that of the two others); and hence he inserts here by anticipation the two

[1] "Already, xvii. 1–4, Luke attempts to return to A.; then to finish, he gives, besides, several passages taken from A." (p. 156).

exhortations, vers. 1–4, which he borrows from this document (A); then he relates further (vers. 5–10) two sayings which he had forgotten, and which he takes from the *Logia* (A), which he is about to quit. But, 1. Why in this case should he not have put these last *in the first place* (which was the natural order, since all the preceding was taken from A), and the two first *afterwards* (which was not less natural, since Luke is about to return to A)? Besides, 2. Has not the exegesis convinced us at every word that Luke certainly did not take all those sayings from the same written source as Mark and Matthew? The only explanation which can be given of the fragmentary character of this piece appears to us to be the following: Luke had up to this point related a series of exhortations given by Jesus, the occasion of which he was able to a certain extent to indicate; but he found some in his sources which were mentioned without any historical indication. It is this remnant scrap at the bottom of the portfolio, if I may so speak, which he delivers to us as it was, and without any introduction. Hence follow two consequences: 1. Luke's introductions in this part are not of his inventing. For why could not his ingenious mind have provided for these last exhortations as well as for all the preceding? A historical case like those of xi. 1, 45, xii. 13, 41, etc., was not difficult to imagine. 2. There is no better proof of the historical reality of the sayings of Jesus quoted in our Syn., than this fragmentary character which surprises us. Discourses which the disciples had put into the mouth of their Master would not have presented this broken appearance.

THIRD CYCLE.—CHAP. XVII. 11–XIX. 27.

The Last Scenes of the Journey.

This third section brings us to Bethany, to the gates of Jerusalem, and to the morning of Palm Day. It seems to me evident that Luke, in ver. 11, intends simply to indicate the continuation of the journey begun ix. 51, and not, as Wieseler will have it, the beginning of a different journey. In consequence of the multiplicity of events related, Luke reminds us from time to time of the general situation. It is in the course of this third section that his narrative rejoins that of the two other Syn. (xviii. 15 et seq.), at the time when children are brought to Jesus that He may bless them. This event being expressly placed in Perœa by Matthew and Mark, it is clear that the following events must have taken place at the time when Jesus was about to cross the Jordan, or had just passed it.

1. *The Ten Lepers:* xvii. 11–19.—Vers. 11–19.[1] Ver. 11, even in its construction, reminds us of ix. 51. The καὶ αὐτός, has here, as well as there, peculiar force. The caravans of Galilee took either the Samaritan route or the Peræan. Jesus follows neither; He makes one *for Himself;* the result of His deliberate wish, which is intermediate between the two,—a fact which seems to be expressed by the so marked resuming of the subject (καὶ αὐτός).—The phrase διὰ μεσοῦ may signify in Greek: while *travelling through* both of those provinces, or while *passing between* them. Olshausen takes the first sense: he alleges that from Ephraim, whither Jesus retired after the resurrection of Lazarus (John xi. 54), He visited Galilee once more, thus traversing from south to north, first Samaria, and then Galilee. Gess (p. 74) also regards this return from Ephraim to Capernaum as probable.[2] But the governed clause *to Jerusalem* would in this sense be real irony. The second sense is therefore the only possible one: Jesus was passing along the confines of the two provinces. This meaning is confirmed by the absence of the article before the two proper names: *Samaria and Galilee.* He directed His steps from west to east, toward the Jordan, which He must cross to enter Peræa,—a fact which harmonizes, as we have seen, with Matt. xix. 1, Mark x. 1, and even John x. 40–42.—Luke probably recalls here this general situation in view of the following narrative, in which we find a Samaritan leper mingling with Jewish lepers. Community of suffering had, in their case, broken down the national barrier.—Less bold than the leper of chap. vi., those unhappy men kept at a distance, according to the law, Lev. xiii. 46. The space which a leper was bound to keep between him and every other person is estimated by some at 4, by others at 100 cubits. The cry which they uttered with one voice on perceiving Jesus, draws His attention

[1] Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. omit αυτον after πορευεσθαι.—ℵ. B. L., δια μεσον instead of δια μεσου.—Ver. 12. ℵ. L. some Mnn., υπηντησαν instead of απηντησαν.—The same Mjj. omit αυτω.

[2] Gess's reason is the scene of the didrachma, Matt. xvii. 24–27; for the collection for the temple was made in March. But in the year which preceded His death, Jesus may possibly not have paid till summer the tribute which was properly due in spring. The form of the collector's question, Matt. ver. 24, seems to suppose a payment which was at once voluntary and in arrears. It is not therefore necessary, on this ground, to hold a return from Capernaum to Galilee immediately before the last Passover.

to the pitiable sight. Without even telling them of their cure, He bids them go and give thanks for it. There is a dash, as it were, of triumphant joy in this unexpected order. *As they go* (ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν), they observe the first symptoms of the cure which has been wrought. Immediately one of them, seized with an irresistible emotion of gratitude, turns back, uttering aloud cries of joy and adoration; and arrived in the presence of Jesus, he prostrates himself at His feet in thanksgiving. The difference is to be observed between δοξάζειν, *glorifying*, applied to God, and εὐχαριστεῖν, *giving thanks*, applied to Jesus. As He recognises him to be a Samaritan, Jesus feels to the quick the difference between those simple hearts, within which there yet vibrates the natural feeling of gratitude, and Jewish hearts, encrusted all over with pharisaic pride and ingratitude; and immediately, no doubt, the lot of His gospel in the world is presented to His mind. But He contents Himself with bringing into view the present contrast.—Εὑρέθησαν has not for its subject the participle ὑποστρέψαντες, taken substantively, but ἄλλοι understood. Bleek refers the last words: *thy faith hath saved thee*, to the physical cure which Jesus would confirm to the sufferer by leading him to develope that disposition of faith which has procured it for him. But have we not here rather a new blessing, of which Jesus gives special assurance to this leper? The faith of which Jesus speaks is not merely that which brought him at the first, but more still that which has brought him back. By this return he has sealed for ever the previous transitory connection which his cure had formed between Jesus and him; he recognises His word as the instrument of the miracle; he unites himself closely to the entire person of Him whose power only he had sought at the first. And thereby his physical cure is transformed into a moral cure, into salvation.

Criticism suspects this narrative on account of its universalistic tendency. But if it had been invented with a didactic aim, would the lesson to be drawn from it have been so completely passed over in silence? We must in this case also suspect the healing of the Gentile centurion's servant in Matthew; and that with more reason still, because Jesus insists on the general lesson to be derived from the event.

2. *The Messiah's Coming:* xvii. 20–xviii. 8.—This piece embraces: 1*st.* A question put by the Pharisees respecting the time of the appearance of the kingdom of God, and the answer of Jesus (vers. 20, 21); 2*d.* A discourse addressed by Jesus to His disciples on the same subject (vers. 22–37); 3*d.* The parable of the unjust judge, which applies the subject treated practically to believers (xviii. 1–8).

1*st.* Vers. 20 and 21.[1] *The Spirituality of the Kingdom.*—"*And when He was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, He answered them, and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.* 21. *Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.*"—It is known with what impatience the Pharisees waited for the manifestations of the Messianic kingdom. It is natural that they should desire to know the opinion of Jesus on the subject. Besides, they would have been glad to embarrass Him in the matter, or to drag from Him some heresy. Their question rested on a purely external view of this divine kingdom; His advent appeared to their mind as a great and sudden dramatic act. In the gospel point of view, this expectation is certainly not altogether false; but humanity must be prepared for the new external and divine state of things by a spiritual work wrought in the depths of the heart; and it is this internal advent which Jesus thinks good to put first in relief before such interlocutors. The side of the truth which He thinks proper to set forth is, as usual, that which is mistaken by the parties addressing Him. To the Pharisee Nicodemus, who came to Him with a question analogous to that which His *confrères* are now putting, Jesus replies exactly in the same way. The expression: μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, *in such a way as to be observed,* relates to the observation of objects falling under the senses. The present ἔρχεται, *cometh,* is that of the idea. Now, since the kingdom is not established in a visible manner, it might happen that it should be present without men suspecting it (xi. 20). And this is exactly the case (xi. 20: *has surprised you*).

Lo here, lo there,—these words express the impression of those who think they *see* it coming; Jesus puts in opposition to them His own *behold.* This last relates to the surprise which

[1] Ver. 21. ℵ. B. L. omit ἰδοὺ before ἐκεῖ.

should be felt by His hearers on learning that the kingdom is already present. The words ἐντὸς ὑμῶν are explained by almost all modern interpreters in the sense of, *in the midst of you.* Philologically this meaning is possible; it may be harmonized with the γάρ. But the verb ἐστιν would in this case necessarily require to be put before the regimen; for this verb *is* would have the emphasis, "*it is really present.*" The idea *among you* would be secondary. If the regimen ἐντὸς ὑμῶν has the emphasis (and its place proves that it has), it can only be because these words contain the reason introduced by *for.* They should therefore serve to prove that the kingdom of God may have come without its coming being remarked; and this is what follows from its internal, spiritual nature. The meaning of this regimen is therefore, *within you.* Besides, the prep. ἐντός, *within,* always includes a contrast to the idea *without.* If, therefore, we give to it here the meaning of *among,* we must still suppose an understood contrast, that between the Jews as people *within,* and the Gentiles as people *without.* There is nothing in the context giving rise to such an antithesis. In giving to ἐντός the meaning *within,* we are led back to the idea expressed in the answer of Jesus to Nicodemus: "Except a man be *born again,* he cannot *see* the kingdom of God," which confirms our explanation. Ἐστί is, like ἔρχεται, the present of essence.

2*d.* Vers. 22–37. *The Coming of the Kingdom.*—To the Pharisees Jesus declared what they did not know, the spiritual essence of the kingdom. But Jesus did not mean to deny the external and final appearing of a divine state of things. To develope this other side of the truth, He turns to His disciples, because it is only to those who possess something of His spiritual life that He can speak profitably of His future return. Thus it is that the treatment of the same subject is modified, according to the character of those whom Jesus addresses. Besides, the abstract idea of the coming of the kingdom is now presented as the reappearing of Jesus Himself. The truth could only be expounded in this aspect to believers. We may see with what justice the *Revue de Théologie* alleges: "The first two verses (vers. 20, 21) are *in contradiction* to the rest, and have no connection with what follows!" (1867, p. 386.)

The discourse of Jesus bears on three points: 1*st*. When and how will Jesus reappear (vers. 22–25)? 2*d*. What will be the state of the world then (vers. 26–30)? 3*d*. What will be the moral condition of salvation in that last crisis (vers. 31–37)?

Vers. 22–25.[1] "*And He said unto the disciples, The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it.* 23. *And they shall say to you, See here! or, see there! go not after them, nor follow them.* 24. *For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in His day.* 25. *But first must He suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation.*"—The course of thought is this: The kingdom, in the sense understood by the Pharisees, will not come immediately (ver. 22); and when it shall come, no uncertainty will be felt about His appearing (vers. 23, 24). Ver. 25 returns to the idea of ver. 22.

Ἡμέραι (ver. 22), *days*, long days, during which there will be time to sigh for the visible presence of the Master. Comp. v. 35. The desire *to see one of the days of the Son of man* may refer either to the painful *regret* of the Church when she recalls the happiness enjoyed by her while He was present on the earth, or to her impatient *waiting* for some manifestation from on high announcing that the day is at length near. Substantially, the first meaning leads to the second, as regret does to desire; but the second idea is the dominant one, according to the context. When the apostles or their successors shall have passed a long time on the earth in the absence of their Lord, when they shall be at the end of their preaching and their apologetic demonstrations, and when around them scepticism, materialism, pantheism, and deism shall more and more gain the ascendency, then there shall be formed in their souls an ardent longing for that Lord who keeps silence and remains hid; they will call for some divine manifestation, *a single one* (μίαν), like that of the old days, to refresh their hearts and sustain the fainting Church. But

[1] Ver. 23. ℵ. B³ L., ἰδου ἐκει before ἰδου ὡδε. 5 Mjj. omit η before ἰδου.—ℵ. M., και ἰδου.—Ver. 24. All the Mjj., D. excepted, omit και after ἐσται.—B. D. Italiq. omit ἐν τῃ ἡμερᾳ αὐτου.

to the end, the task will be to walk by faith (*οὐκ ὄψεσθε, ye shall not see*). Need we be astonished if in such circumstances the faith of the great majority verges to extinction (xviii. 8)?

With this heightening of expectation among believers there will correspond the seducing appeals of falsehood (ver. 23). Literally taken, this verse is in contradiction to ver. 21. But ver. 21 related to the spiritual kingdom, whose coming *cannot* be observed or proclaimed, while the subject now in question is the visible kingdom, the appearing of which shall be *falsely* announced. Why shall those announcements be necessarily false? Ver. 24 gives the explanation.—Gess exhibits the application of this teaching, on the one hand, to the folly of the Romanists who will have no Church without a *visible* head, and, on the other, to that of Protestant sectaries who expect the appearing of the kingdom of God to-day in Palestine, to-morrow in Russia, etc.

Ver. 24. The Lord's coming will be universal and instantaneous. Men do not run here or there to see a flash of lightning: it shines simultaneously on all points of the horizon. So the Lord will appear at the same moment to the view of all living. His appearances as the Risen One in the upper room, when closed, are the prelude of this last advent. But if He is to return, He must go away, go away persecuted. This is the subject of ver. 25.—*This generation* can designate no other than the Jewish contemporaries of the Messiah. A separation is about to supervene between Israel and its now present Messiah. And this rejection of the Messiah by His own people will be the signal for the invisibility of His kingdom. Comp. the antithesis xiii. 35 (the faith of Israel bringing back the Messiah from heaven). How long will this abnormal state last? Jesus Himself knows not.—But He declares that this epoch of His invisibility will terminate in an entirely materialistic state of things, vers. 26–30, which will be brought to an end suddenly by His advent.

Vers. 26–30.[1] "*And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man.* 27. *They did eat,*

[1] Ver. 27. The Mss. are divided between ἐξεγαμίζοντο (T. R.) and ἐγαμίζοντο (Alex.).—Ver. 28. ℵ. B. L. R. X., καθως instead of και ως.—Ver. 30. The Mss. are divided between κατα ταυτα (T. R.) and κατα τα αὐτα.

they drank, they married, and were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark; and the flood came, and destroyed them all. 28. *Likewise also, as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded;* 29. *But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all.* 30. *Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.*"—While believers sigh with growing ardour for the return of their Lord, carnal security more or less complete takes possession of the race. It is an epoch like those which have preceded all the great catastrophes of history. The business of earthly life is carried through with regularity; but religious feeling gradually disappears from the heart of men who have become secularized. The *days of Noe* denote the 120 years during which the ark was a-building. Ἐξεγαμίζοντο strictly means, *were given in marriage*, that is to say, young daughters by their parents. The finite verbs ἤσθιον, ἔπινον (ver. 28), ἔβρεξε (ver. 29), are in apposition to ἐγένετο, and, as such, are still dependent on ὡς. The apodosis does not occur till ver. 30. This form is analogous to the Hebrew construction which we have so often observed in Luke (ἐγένετο, with a finite verb for its subject). Ἔβρεξε is generally regarded as active: God *caused it to rain.* Comp. Gen. xix. 24, καὶ κύριος ἔβρεξεν (Matt. v. 45). But as in this case the ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ would be pleonastic, and as βρέχω is found in Polybius and the later Greek authors in a neuter sense, it is more natural to adopt this sense here, by which we at the same time preserve the parallelism between ἀπώλεσεν (subject, πῦρ καὶ θεῖον) and the ἀπώλεσεν, ver. 27 (subject, κατακλυσμός).—The word ἀποκαλύπτεται supposes that Jesus is present, but that a veil conceals His person from the view of the world. All at once the veil is lifted, and the glorified Lord is visible to all. This term occurs again in the same sense, 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7; and perhaps 1 Cor. iii. 13. The point of comparison between this event and the examples quoted is the surprise caused in the bosom of security.—Matt. xxiv. 37–39 contains a passage parallel to vers. 26, 27 (the example of Noe). The idea is the same; but the terms are so different, that they forbid us to assume that the two editions proceed from the same text.

Vers. 31–37.[1] "*In that day, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away: and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back.* 32. *Remember Lot's wife.* 33. *Whosoever shall seek to save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life, shall preserve it.* 34. *I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left.* 35. *Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left.* 36, 37. *And they answered and said unto Him, Where, Lord? And He said unto them, Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together.*"—Here is the practical conclusion of the discourse. Jesus describes that disposition of mind which, in this last crisis, shall be the condition of salvation. The Lord passes with His heavenly retinue. He attracts all the inhabitants of the earth who are willing and ready to join Him; but it transpires in the twinkling of an eye. Whoever is not already loosened from earthly things, so as to haste away without hesitation, taking flight toward Him freely and joyously, remains behind. Thus precisely had Lot's wife perished with the goods, from which she could not part. Agreeably to His habitual method, Jesus characterizes this disposition of mind by a series of external acts, in which it is concretely realized. The *Revue de Théologie* (passage quoted, p. 337) condemns Luke for here applying to the Parousia the counsel to flee, which has no meaning, except as applied to the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv.). This accusation is false, for there is no mention of *fleeing* from one part of the earth to another, but of rising from the earth to the Lord, as He passes and disappears: "*Let him not come down* (from the roof); but, forgetting *all that is in the house,* let him be ready to follow the Lord!" So he who is *in the fields* is not to attempt to return home to carry upwards with him some object of value. The Lord is there; if any one belongs to Him, let him leave every-

[1] Ver. 32. B. L. It$^{\text{alq.}}$, περιποιησασθαι instead of σωσαι.—Ver. 33. ℵ. B. D. R. 3 Mnn. omit αυτην after απολεση or απολεσει.—Ver. 34. All the Mjj., B. excepted, εις instead of ο εις.—Ver. 35. ℵ* 1 Mn. omit this verse.—Ver. 36. This verse is wanting in all the Mjj., D. U. excepted, in several Mnn. It^{plerique} (taken from Matthew).—Ver. 37. E. G. H. 25 Mnn., πτωμα instead of σωμα.—ℵ. B. L. U. Δ. 30 Mnn. add και after εκει.—ℵ. B. L. Q., επισυναχθησονται instead of συναχθησονται.

thing at once to accompany Him (Matt. xxiv. 18: the labourer should not even return to seek his dress, which he laid aside to work). This saying, especially in the form of Matthew, evidently referred to the Parousia, which shall come suddenly, and not to the destruction of Jerusalem, which will be preceded by an armed invasion and a long war. Luke's context is therefore preferable to Matthew's.—Ver. 23. *To save one's life,* by riveting it to some object with which it is identified, is the means of losing it, of being left behind with this perishing world; *to give one's life,* by quitting everything at once, is the only means of saving it, by laying hold of the Lord who is passing. See on ix. 24. Jesus here substitutes for the phrase *to save his life,* the word ζωογονεῖν, literally, *to give it birth alive.* The word is that by which the LXX. express the Piel and Hiphil of חיה, *to live.* Here it is having the natural life born again, that it may be reproduced in the form of spiritual, glorified, eternal life. The absolute sacrifice of the natural life is the means of this transformation. Here is a word of unfathomable depth and of daily application.

At this time a selection will take place (ver. 34),—a selection which will instantaneously break all earthly relations, even the most intimate, and from which there will arise a new grouping of humanity in two new families or societies, the *taken* and the *left.* Λέγω ὑμῖν, *I tell you,* announces something weighty. Bleek thinks, that as the subject under discussion is the return of the Lord as *judge,* to be taken is to perish, to be left is to escape. But the *middle* παραλαμβάνεσθαι, *to take to one's self,* to welcome as one's own, can only have a favourable meaning (John xiv. 3). And St. Paul certainly understood the word in this sense; for it is probably not without relation to this saying that he teaches, 1 Thess. iv. 17, the taking up into the air of the believers who are alive at the return of Christ; it is the ascension of the disciples, as the complement of their Master's. Ἀφιέναι, *to forsake,* to leave behind, as xiii. 35. The image of ver. 34 supposes that the Parousia takes place at night. Ver. 35, on the contrary, supposes it happening during the day. It matters little. For one hemisphere it will be in the day; for the other, at night. The idea remains the same: whether he is sleeping, or whether he is working, man ought to be sufficiently dis-

engaged to give himself over without delay to the Lord who draws him.—Handmills were used among the ancients. When the millstone was large, two persons turned it together.—Ver. 36, which is wanting in almost all the Mjj., is taken from the parallel passage in Matthew.—Thus the beings who shall have been most closely connected here below, shall, in the twinkling of an eye, be parted for ever.

The apostle's question (ver. 37) is one of curiosity. Although Jesus had already answered it in ver. 24, He takes advantage of it to close the conversation by a declaration which applies it to the whole world. The natural phenomenon, described by Job xxxix. 30, is used by Jesus to symbolize the universality of the judgment proclaimed. The *carcase* is humanity entirely secular, and destitute of the life of God (vers. 26–30; comp. ix. 60, *Let the dead . . .*). The *eagles* represent punishment alighting on such a society. There is no allusion in this figure to the Roman standards, for there is no reference in the preceding discourse to the destruction of Jerusalem. Comp. also Matt. xxiv. 28, where this saying applies exclusively to the Parousia. The eagle, properly so called, does not live in flocks, it is true, and does not feed on carrion. But ἀετός, as well as נשר, Prov. xxx. 17, may (as Furrer shows, *Bedeut. der Bibl. Geogr.* p. 13) denote the great vulture (*gyps fulvus*), equal to the eagle in size and strength, which is seen in hundreds on the plain of Gennesareth. Some Fathers have applied the image of the *body* to Jesus glorified, and that of the *eagles* to the saints who shall accompany Him at His advent!

3d. xviii. 1–8.[1] *The Widow and the Unjust Judge.*—This parable is peculiar to Luke. The formula ἔλεγε δὲ καί, "Furthermore, hear this also," announces it as the conclusion of the whole discourse xvii. 20 et seq.—Weizsäcker (p. 139) and Holtzmann (p. 132) think that the introduction, ver. 1, gives this parable a commonplace application (the duty of perseverance in prayer), which does not belong to the original

[1] Ver. 1. ℵ. B. L. M. several Mnn. It[alliq.] omit καὶ after δι:—15 Mjj. 60 Mnn. add αὐτους after προσευχεσθαι.—The Mss. are divided between εκκακειν and ἐγκακειν.—Ver. 3. The Mjj., A. excepted, omit τις after δι.—Ver. 4. The Mss. are divided between ηθελησεν (T. R.) and ηθελεν (Alex.).—ℵ. B. L. X. It[plerique], ουδε ανθρωπον instead of και ανθρωπον ουκ.—Ver. 7. ℵ. B. L. Q., αυτω instead of προς αυτον.—ℵ. A. B. D. L. Q. X. Π. 3 Mnn., μακροθυμει instead of μακροθυμων.

idea of this discourse (the imminence of the Parousia). But is there not a very close correspondence between the duty of persevering prayer, and the danger which the Church runs of being overcome by the carnal slumber which has just been described in the preceding portraiture? The Son of man has been rejected; He has gone from view; the masses are plunged in gross worldliness; men of God are become as rare as in Sodom. What is, then, the position of the Church? That of a widow whose only weapon is incessant prayer. It is only by means of this intense concentration that faith will be preserved. But such is precisely the disposition which, Jesus fears, may not be found even in the Church at His return. The parable is therefore placed here most appropriately, and the introduction is in perfect keeping with its first intention. Comp. xxi. 34–36, where we find the same ideas in correspondence—the danger of being spiritually overcharged in the last times, and the duty of unceasing vigilance and prayer. *Ἐκκακεῖν, to relax,* to let go, not to hold determinedly to one's rights, like the widow.

There lies at the foundation of this parable, as in those of the indiscreet friend and the lost sheep (xi. and xv.), an argument *à fortiori:* "Were God like this judge, He would not resist the Church's believing prayer; how much less, being what He is!" The condition of the Church after the Lord's departure is like that of a *widow,* and of a widow deprived of her rights. The Lord has acquired for His own glorious prerogatives, which have not yet passed into the domain of facts, and the enjoyment of which, if they esteem them at their just value, they should claim without ceasing. *Ἐκδικεῖν* (ver. 3): to deliver (*ἐκ*) by a judicial sentence (*δίκη*). This term does not therefore include the notion of vengeance, but that of justice to be rendered to the oppressed.—If *ὑπωπιάζειν, to disfigure the face,* be taken in the weakened sense of *importuning,* it will be necessary to understand *εἰς τέλος, to the end:* "Lest she importune me to the end (indefinitely)." But Meyer prefers keeping the strict sense, both of the verb and of *εἰς τέλος* (at last): "Lest she come at last to strike me." The participle *ἐρχομένη, coming to me,* decides in favour of this second meaning. There is in this saying a touch of pleasantry.—Ver. 6. "*Hear:* for there is a lesson to be drawn

even from this impious language."—Ver. 7. *The continual crying* of the elect recalls the ardent desire of believers to see one of the days of the Son of man, xvii. 22.—The *elect* are those whom God has drawn by the calling of Jesus from the bosom of lost humanity, agreeably to the eternal plan of salvation.—If we read *μακροθυμεῖ* (Alex.), we must give this proposition the interrogative meaning: "Will He not do right . . ., and *will He be slow* in their behalf, that is to say, to punish those who oppress them?" But the sense which must thus be given to *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς* is not natural. It is much better, therefore, to read: *μακροθυμῶν*, the meaning of which is (with *καί*): "*Though He restrain His anger on account of His* [oppressed] *elect.*" God suffers with them (Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou *me?*); and therefore Jesus can say of God, that He *restrains Himself on their account.* If, then, He does not interpose immediately to deliver them, it is not from indifference; it is from long-suffering to their oppressors. Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 9. It is nowhere said that the *object* of the unceasing cry of the elect is the punishment of their adversaries, which would not be in keeping with the figure of the parable; it is their own deliverance by their being put in possession of the heritage to which they are entitled. But God, it is true, cannot grant this petition without breaking the power of those who stand in the way of this act of justice. It is to this aspect of His answer that allusion is made by the *μακροθυμεῖν.*

Ἐν τάχει, speedily, does not at all mean that the limit of divine forbearance is near, which would be inconsistent with the long interval of time announced in the words, *days will come* . . . (xvii. 22). The word rather signifies, that the hearing once given, the deliverance will be accomplished with small delay, in the twinkling of an eye; comp. Rom. xvi. 20 (where, too, we should translate not *shortly,* but *very quickly*). *Πλήν*: "I am not afraid of the Judge failing in His duty. The *only* thing which makes me anxious is this, lest the widow fail in hers."—*Τὴν πίστιν*: not *some faith* in general, but *the faith,*—that special faith of which the widow's is an image, which, in spite of the judge's obstinate silence and long apparent indifference, perseveres in claiming its right. —*On the earth,* in opposition to the Son of man who comes

again from heaven.—We must here remember the sad picture of the state of humanity at this epoch (xvii. 26–30). Is it not to such a state of things that Jesus also makes allusion, Matt. xxv. 5: "And they *all* slumbered and slept?"

Hilgenfeld and others find in this parable a thirst for vengeance, which corresponds rather with the furious zeal of the Apocalypse than the true Pauline feeling of Luke. This passage must therefore be "one of those *most ancient* parts of our Gospel" which Luke borrowed from a Jewish document. Others, like De Wette, see in it, on the contrary, the traces of a *later* period, when the Church had become the victim of persecution. But, 1. This alleged thirst for vengeance nowhere appears in the text. 2. Our passage is full of gentleness in comparison with expressions of indignation used by Paul himself (Rom. ii. 4, 5, 8, 9; 1 Thess. iii. 15, 16; 2 Thess. i. 8). The spirit of this parable is therefore not in the least opposed to that of the *Pauline* Luke. 3. There is allusion, no doubt, to the abnormal position of the Church between Christ's departure and His return, but not to persecution strictly so called.

While Hilgenfeld affects to distinguish in this piece the originally Ebionite passages (xvii. 1–4, 11–19; xviii. 1–8) from those which are of Luke's composition (xvii. 5–10, 20–37; xviii. 1–14), Volkmar (*Evangel. Marcions*, p. 203) maintains that the arrangement of the piece is systematic, and rests on the well-known Pauline triad: *love* (xvii. 1–4), *faith* (vers. 5–19), *hope* (ver. 30 et seq.). But it is easy to see how forced it is to apply any such scheme to those different accounts.

3. *The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican:* xviii. 9–14.—Vers. 9–14.[1] This parable is peculiar to Luke. Who are those τινές, *certain*, to whom it is addressed? They cannot be Pharisees. Luke would have named them, as at xvi. 14; and Jesus would not have presented to them as an example, in a parable, one of themselves, while designating him expressly in this character. Bleek thinks that they were disciples of Jesus. But Luke would have equally designated them (xvi. 1). They were therefore probably members of the company following Jesus, who had not yet openly declared for Him, and who manifested a haughty distance to certain sinners, known to be such, who were in the company with them; comp. xix. 7.—The word σταθείς, *standing erect* (ver.

[1] Ver. 9. The Mss. are divided between πρὸς and πρὸς δὲ καί.—Ver. 11. ℵ. It[plerique], omit πρὸς ἑαυτόν.—Ver. 12. ℵ. B., ἀποδεκατεύω instead of ἀποδεκατῶ.—Ver. 13. ℵ. B. G. L. 5 Mnn. Syr[cur]., ὁ δὲ τελώνης instead of καὶ ὁ τελώνης.—8 Mjj. 15 Mnn. It. Vg. omit τῆς before τοῦ στήθους.—Ver. 14. Instead of ἢ ἐκεῖνος (T. R. with some Mnn.), 16 Mjj. and 150 Mnn. read ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, and ℵ. B. L., παρ' ἐκεῖνον.

11), indicates a posture of assurance, and even boldness (comp. *standing afar off*, ver. 13). — *Πρὸς ἑαυτόν* does not depend on *σταθείς*: "standing *aside*, at a distance, from the vulgar," —it would have required *καθ' ἑαυτόν* (Meyer),—but on *προσηύχετο*: "*he prayed*, speaking thus *to himself* . . ." It was less a prayer in which he gave thanks to God, than a congratulation which he addressed to himself. True thanksgiving is always accompanied by a feeling of humiliation. The Pharisees fasted on the Monday and Thursday of every week. *Κτᾶσθαι* denotes the act of acquiring rather than that of possessing; it therefore refers here to the produce of the fields (xi. 42).—To strike the breast: an emblem of the stroke of death which the sinner feels that he has merited at the hand of God. The *heart* is struck, as the seat of personal life and of sin.— *Λέγω ὑμῖν* (ver. 14): "I tell you, strange as it may appear . . ." —The idea of *justification*, that is to say, of a righteousness bestowed on the sinner by a divine sentence, belongs even to the O. T. Comp. Gen. xv. 6; Isa. l. 8, liii. 11.—In the received reading *ἢ ἐκεῖνος, ἤ* is governed by *μᾶλλον, rather*, understood. The suppression of the adverb *rather* serves to prevent the idea that the Pharisee also received his share of justification. In the reading *ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος* (more strongly supported than the others), *ἤ* is explained in the same way, and *γάρ* has, as is often the case, an interrogative value: "*For* think you that he (the Pharisee) could be justified?" This somewhat difficult turn of expression has occasioned the Alex. correction *παρ' ἐκεῖνον*.—Our Lord loves to close His parables with axioms formally expressing the fundamental laws of moral life: God will overthrow all self-exaltation; but He will turn in love to all sincere humiliation.

Undoubtedly, if Luke's object was to point out in the ministry of Jesus the historical foundations for St. Paul's teaching, this piece corresponds most exactly to his intention. But no argument can be drawn therefrom contrary to the truth of the narrative. For the idea of justification *by faith* is one of the axioms not only of the teaching of Jesus, but of that of the O. T. (comp. besides the passages quoted, Hab. ii. 4).

4. *The Children brought to Jesus:* xviii. 15–17.—Vers. 15–17.[1]

[1] Ver. 15. ℵ. B. D. G. L. some Mnn., *επετιμων* instead of *επετιμησαν*.—Ver. 16. ℵ. B. D. G. L. 4 Mnn. Syr^{sch}., *προσεκαλεσατο* (or . . . *λεγει*) *αυτα λεγων* instead of *προσκαλεσαμενος αυτα ειπεν*.

It is here that Luke's narrative rejoins Matthew's (xix. 14) and Mark's (x. 13), after having diverged from them at ix. 51. Jesus is in Peræa. Of his sojourn in this province Matthew and Mark have as yet related only one fact—the conversation with the Pharisees regarding divorce, summarily reproduced by Luke, xvi. 13–19.

By the phrase: *even* infants (*καὶ τά . . .*), ver. 15, Luke would indicate that the consideration enjoyed by Jesus had reached its height. Mothers brought him even their nurslings. The article before *βρέφη* denotes the category.—The apostles think that this is to abuse the goodness and time of their Master. Mark, who likes to depict moral impressions, describes the indignation felt by Jesus (*ἠγανάκτησε*) on perceiving this feeling. Luke is less severe,—the evangelist who is accused of abusing the Twelve. After calling back those little ones who were being sent away (*αὐτά*), Jesus instructs His disciples in respect of them. Matthew, as usual, summarizes.—There is in children a twofold receptivity, negative and positive, humility and confidence. By labour expended on ourselves, we are to return to those dispositions which are natural to the child. The pronoun *τῶν τοιούτων, of such,* does not refer to other children, such as those present, but to all those who voluntarily put on the dispositions indicated. Jesus, according to Mark, clasped those children tenderly in His arms, and put His hands on them, blessing them. Matthew speaks only of the imposition of hands. These touching details are omitted by Luke. For what reason, if he knew them? They agreed so well with the spirit of his Gospel! Volkmar (*Die Evangel.* p. 487) explains this omission by the *prosaic* character of Luke (!). According to the same author, these little children represent the Gentiles saved by grace. Party dogmatics, even in this the simplest narrative of the Gospel!

5. *The Rich Young Man:* vers. 18–30.—In the three Syn. this piece immediately follows the preceding (Matt. xix. 16; Mark x. 17). Oral tradition had connected the two, perhaps because there existed between them a real chronological succession.—Three parts: 1*st.* The conversation with the young man (vers. 18–23); 2*d.* The conversation which takes place in regard to him (vers. 24–27); 3*d.* The conversation of Jesus with the disciples regarding themselves (vers. 28–30).

1*st.* Vers. 18–23.[1] *The Rich Young Man.*—Luke gives this man the title ἄρχων, *chief*, which probably signifies here, president of the synagogue. Matthew and Mark simply say εἷς. Later, Matthew calls him a *young man* (ver. 20). His arrival is given with dramatic effect by Mark: *He came running, and kneeled down before Him.*—He sincerely desired salvation, and he imagined that some generous action, some great sacrifice, would secure this highest good; and this hope supposes that man has power of himself to do good; that therefore he is radically good. This is what is implied in his apostrophe to Jesus: *Good Master;* for it is *the man* in Him whom he thus salutes, knowing Him as yet in no other character. Jesus, by refusing this title in the false sense in which it is given Him, does not accuse Himself of sin, as has been alleged. If He had had a conscience burdened with some trespass, He would have avowed it explicitly. But Jesus reminds him that all goodness in man, as in every creature whatsoever, must flow from God. This axiom is the very foundation of Monotheism. Thereby He strikes directly at the young man's fundamental error. So far as Jesus is concerned, the question of His personal goodness depends solely on the consideration whether His inward dependence on that God, the only Good, is complete or partial. If it is complete, Jesus is good, but with a goodness which is that of God Himself operating in Him. His answer does not touch this personal side of the question. In Matthew, at least according to the Alex. reading, which is probably the true one, the word *good* is omitted in the young man's address, and the answer of Jesus is conceived in these terms: "*Why askest thou me about what is good? One only is good.*" Which may signify: "Good is being joined to God, the only Good;" or: "Good is fulfilling the commandments of God, the only good Being." These two explanations are both unnatural. Even Bleek does not hesitate here to prefer the form of Luke and Mark. That of Matthew is perhaps a modification arising from the fear of inferences hostile to the

[1] Ver. 20. 10 Mjj. 25 Mnn. It^{aliq}. Vg. omit σου after μητερα.—Ver. 21. ℵ. A. B. L. 2 Mnn., εφυλαξα instead of εφυλαξαμην.—Ver. 22. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. Syr. omit ταυτα after ακουσας δε.—ℵ. F. H. V. several Mnn., οτι instead of ιτι.—The Mss. are divided between διαδος and δος (taken from the parallels), and between ουρανω (T. R.) and ουρανοις (Alex.).—Ver. 23. ℵ. B. L., εγενηθη instead of εγενετο.

purity of Jesus, which might be drawn from the form of His answer, as it has been transmitted to us by the two other Syn.

Jesus has just rectified the young man's radical mistake. Now He replies to his question. The work to be done is to love. Jesus quotes the second table, as bearing on works of a more external and palpable kind, and consequently more like one of those which the young man expected to be mentioned. This answer of Jesus is earnest; for to love is to live! (See at x. 28.) The only question is how we can attain to it. But Jesus proceeds like a wise instructor. Far from arresting on their way those who believe in their own strength, He encourages them to prosecute it faithfully to the very end, knowing well that if they are sincere they shall *by the law* die *to the law* (Gal. ii. 19). As Gess says: "To take the law in thorough earnest is the true way to come to Jesus Christ."—The young man's reply (ver. 21) testifies, undoubtedly, great moral ignorance, but also noble sincerity. He knows not the spiritual meaning of the commandments, and thinks that he has really fulfilled them. Here occurs the inimitable stroke of Mark's pencil: "And Jesus, *beholding him, loved him.*" When critics wish to make out Mark to be the compiler of the two other evangelists, they are obliged to say, with De Wette, that Mark himself, inventing this amiable answer, has ascribed to Jesus his own feelings. We see much rather in this saying, one of those strokes which reveal the source whence the narratives of Mark proceed, and which must have been one very near the person of Jesus. It was an apostle who was following the impressions of Jesus as they depicted themselves in His countenance, and who caught as it passed the look of tenderness which He cast on this person so sincere and so innocent.—This look of love was also a scrutinizing look (ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ, Mark v. 21), by which Jesus discerned the good and bad qualities of the heart, and which dictated to Him the following saying. The δέ, with ἀκούσας (ver. 22), is adversative and progressive. It announces a new resolution taken by the Lord. He determines to call this man into the number of His permanent disciples. The real substance of His answer, indeed, is not the order to distribute his goods, but the call to follow Him.

The giving away of his money is only the condition of entering upon that new career which is open to him (see at x. 61, xii. 33). In the proposal which He makes to him, Jesus observes the character which best corresponds to the desire expressed by the young man. He asked of Him some work to do; and Jesus points out one, and that decisive, which perfectly corresponds to his object, inasmuch as it assures him of salvation. To disengage oneself from everything in order to follow Jesus conclusively,—such is really salvation, life. The formal correspondence of this answer to the young man's thought appears in the expression, *One thing thou lackest* (Luke and Mark); and more clearly still in that of Matthew, *If thou wilt be perfect, go . . .* Undoubtedly, according to the view of Jesus, man cannot do more or better than fulfil the law (Matt. v. 17, 48). Only the law must be understood not in the letter, but in the spirit (Matt. v.). The perfection to which Jesus calls the young man is not the fulfilling of a law *superior* to the law strictly so called, but the real fulfilling, in opposition to that external, literal fulfilling which the young man already had (ver. 21). This *one thing* which he lacks is *the spirit* of the law, that is, love ready to give everything: this is the whole of the law (Luke vi.). The words, *Thou shalt have treasure in heaven,* do not signify that this almsgiving will open heaven to him, but that, when he shall have entered into this abode, he will find there, as the result of his sacrifice, grateful beings, whose love shall be to him an inexhaustible treasure (see at xvi. 9). The act, which is the real condition of entering heaven, is indicated by the last word, to which the whole converges, *Follow me.* The mode of following Jesus varies according to times. At that time, in order to be inwardly attached to Him, it was necessary for a man to follow Him externally, and consequently to abandon his earthly position. At the present day, when Jesus lives no more in the body here below, the only condition is the spiritual one, but with all those moral conditions which flow from our relation to Him, according to each one's character and place.—The sorrow which this answer occasions the young man is expressed by Mark in the most dramatic way: *He heaved a deep sigh* (στενγνάσας). The Gospel of the Hebrews thus described this

scene: "Then the rich man began to scratch his head, for that was not to his mind. And the Lord said to him: How, then, canst thou say, I have kept the law; for it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and lo! many of thy brethren, children of Abraham, live in the gutter, and die of hunger, while thy table is loaded with good things, and nothing is sent out to them?"[1] Such is the writing which some modern critics (*e.g.* Baur) allege to be the original of our Matthew, and the parent of our synoptical literature!

2*d.* Vers. 24–27.[2] *The Conversation regarding the Rich Man.* —It is not the fact of proprietorship which hinders the soul from taking its flight to spiritual blessings; it is the feeling of security which it inspires. So, in Mark, Jesus says, in explanation of His first declaration: "How hard is it for *them that trust* in riches to enter . . .!" The Shemites denote the impossibility of a thing by the image of a heavily-laden camel arriving at a city gate which is low and narrow, and through which it cannot pass. Then, to give this image the piquant form which the Oriental proverb loves, this gate is transformed into the eye of a needle. Some commentators and copyists, not understanding this figure, have changed *κάμηλος, camel,* into *κάμιλος* (the *η* was pronounced *ι*), a very unusual word, which does not occur even in the ancient lexicographers, and which, it is alleged, sometimes denotes a ship's cable. In the received text (*τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος*), *ῥαφίδος* is a correction borrowed from Mark and Matthew; the true reading in Luke is *βελόνης*, which also signifies *needle.* Instead of the word *τρυμαλία*, the Alex. read *τρύπημα* (or *τρῆμα*). The first form might come from Mark; but it is more probable that it is the second which is taken from Matthew, the Gospel most generally used. We must therefore read in Luke, *τρυμαλιᾶς βελόνης.*

To exclude the rich from salvation was, it seemed, to exclude all; for if the most blessed among men can only be saved with difficulty, what will become of the rest? Such

[1] Quoted by Origen, in Matt. xix. 19.

[2] Ver. 24. ℵ. B. L. 4 Mnn. omit *περιλυπον γενομενον.*—B. L., *εισπορευονται* instead of *εισελευσονται.*—Ver. 25. S. 7 Mnn., *καμιλον* instead of *καμηλον.*—ℵ. B. D. *τρηματος*, L. R. *τρυπηματος*, instead of *τρυμαλιας.*—ℵ. B. D. L. 8 Mnn., *βελονης* instead of *ραφιδος.*—A. D. M. P. 20 Mnn. Syr^cur. It^plerique, Vg., *διελθειν* instead of *εισελθειν.*

appears to be the connection between vers. 25 and 26. De Wette joins them in a somewhat different way: "As every one more or less seeks riches, none therefore can be saved." This connection is less natural.—Jesus, according to Matthew and Mark, at this point turns on His disciples a look full of earnestness (ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς, *looking upon them*): "It is but too true; but there is a sphere in which the impossible is possible, that of the divine operation (παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, *with God*)." Thus Jesus in the twinkling of an eye lifts the mind of His hearers from human works, of which alone the young man was thinking, to that divine work of radical regeneration which proceeds from the One only good, and of which Jesus is alone the instrument. Comp. a similar and equally rapid gradation of ideas, John iii. 2, 5.—Which would have been better for this young man—to leave his goods to become the companion in labour of the St. Peters and St. Johns, or to keep those possessions so soon to be laid waste by the Roman legions?

3*d*. Vers. 28–30.[1] *The Conversation regarding the Disciples.* —There had been a day in the life of the disciples when a similar alternative had been put before them; they had resolved it in a different way. What was to accrue to them from the course which they had taken? Peter asks the question innocently, in the name of all. The form of his inquiry in Matthew, *What shall we have therefore?* contains, more expressly than that of Luke and Mark, the idea of an expected recompense. In Matthew, the Lord enters at once into Peter's thought, and makes a special promise to the Twelve, one of the grandest which He addressed to them. Then, in the parable of the labourers, He warns them against indulging pride, on the ground that they have been the first to follow Him. It is difficult fully to harmonize this parable with the special promise which precedes it, without holding that the promise was conditional, and was not to be fulfilled, except in so far as they did not abandon themselves to the spirit of pride combated in the parable, which savours of refinement. As, therefore, Luke places this same promise in

[1] Ver. 28. ℵ° B. D. L. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, αφεντες ιδια instead of αφηκαμεν παντα και.—Ver. 30. ℵ. B. L. 3 Mnn., ος ουχι instead of ος ου.—B. D. M. 10 Mnn., λαβη instead of απολαβη.

a wholly different setting, xxii. 28–30, a context with which it perfectly agrees, it is probable that Matthew placed it here through an association of ideas which admits of easy explanation. According to Luke and Mark, the promise by which Jesus answered Peter is such as to apply to all believers; and it behoved to be so, if Jesus did not wish to favour the feeling of self-exaltation which breathed in the question of the apostle. There is even in the form, *There is no man that* . . . (Mark and Luke), the express intention to give to this promise the widest possible application.—All the relations of natural life find their analogies in the bonds formed by community of faith. Hence there arises for the believer a compensation for the painful rupture of fleshly ties, which Jesus knew so well by experience (viii. 19–21; comp. with viii. 1–3); and every true believer can, like Him, speak of fathers and mothers, brethren and children, who form his new spiritual family. Luke and Mark speak, besides, of *houses;* Matthew, of *lands.* The communion of Christian love in reality procures for each believer the enjoyment of every sort of good belonging to his brethren; yet, to prevent His disciples from supposing that it is an earthly paradise to which He is inviting them, He adds in Mark, *with persecutions.* Matthew and Luke had assuredly no dogmatic reason for omitting this important correction, if they had known it. —Luke likewise omits here the maxim, "*Many that are first shall be last,* etc. . . .," with which this piece closes in Mark, and which in Matthew introduces the parable of the labourers.

The common source of the three Syn. cannot be the proto-Mark, as Holtzmann will have it, unless we hold it to be at their own hand that Luke ascribes to this rich man the title, *ruler of the synagogue,* and that Matthew calls him a *young man.* As to Luke's Ebionite tendency, criticism is bound to acknowledge, with this piece before it, that if salvation by voluntary poverty is really taught in our Gospel, it is not less decidedly so by the other two Syn.; that it is a heresy, consequently, not of Luke, but of Jesus, —or rather, a sound exegesis can find no such thing in the doctrines which our three evangelists agree in putting in the Master's mouth.

6. *The Third Announcement of the Passion:* xviii. 31–34. —Vers. 31–34. Twice already Jesus had announced to His disciples His approaching sufferings (ix. 18 et seq., 43 et seq.); yet, as proved by the request of the two sons of Zebedee (Matt.

xx. 20; Mark x. 35), their hopes constantly turned towards an earthly kingdom. In renewing the announcement of His Passion, Jesus labours to abate the offence which this event will occasion, and even to convert it into a support for their faith, when at a later date they shall compare this catastrophe with the sayings by which He prepared them for it (John xiii. 19). Mark prefaces this third announcement by a remarkable introduction (x. 32). Jesus walks before them on the road; they follow, astonished and alarmed. This picture reminds us of the expression, *He set His face stedfastly* (Luke ix. 51), as well as of the sayings of the disciples and of Thomas (John xi. 8, 16). What substantial harmony under this diversity of form! In general, Luke does not quote prophecies; he does so here once for all, and, as it were, in the mass. The dative τῷ υἱῷ may be made dependent on γεγραμμένα, "written *for the Son of man*," as the sketch of His course; or τελεσθήσεται, "shall be accomplished *in respect to the Son of man*," in His person. The first construction is simpler. The form of the fut. passive used by Luke denotes passive abandonment to suffering more forcibly than the active futures used by Matthew and Mark. The kind of death is not indicated in Luke and Mark so positively as in Matthew (σταυρῶσαι); nevertheless the details in this third announcement are more precise and more dramatic than in the preceding. See at ix. 45. On ver. 34 Riggenbach justly observes: "Toward everything which is contrary to natural desire, there is produced in the heart a blindness which nothing but a miracle can heal."

As ver. 34 has no parallel in the other two Syn., Holtzmann thinks that Luke makes this reflection a substitute for the account of the request preferred by Zebedee's sons, which is found here in the narratives of Matthew and Mark. But does not a perfectly similar reflection occur in the sequel of the second announcement of the Passion (ix. 45), where no such intention is admissible? It is difficult for those who regard Luke's Gospel as systematically hostile to the Twelve, to explain the omission of a fact so unfavourable to two of the leading apostles. Volkmar (*Die Evangel.* p. 501) has found the solution: Luke wishes to avoid offending the Judeo-Christian party, which he desires to gain over to Paulinism! So, artful in what he says, more artful in his silence,—such is Luke in the estimate of this school of criticism!

7. *The Healing of Bartimeus:* xviii. 35–43.—John's very

exact narrative serves to complete the synoptical account. The sojourn of Jesus in Peræa was interrupted by the call which led Jesus to Bethany to the help of Lazarus (John xi.). Thence He proceeds to Ephraim, on the Samaritan side, where He remained in retirement with His disciples (John xi. 54). It was doubtless at this time that the third announcement of His Passion took place. On the approach of the feast of Passover, He went down the valley of the Jordan, rejoining at Jericho the Galilean caravans which arrived by way of Peræa. He had resolved this time to enter Jerusalem with the greatest publicity, and to present Himself to the people and to the Sanhedrim in the character of a king. It was *His hour*, the hour of His manifestation, expected long ago by Mary (John ii. 4), and which His brethren (John vii. 6–8) had thought to precipitate.

Vers. 35–43.[1] Luke speaks of a blind man sitting by the wayside, whom Jesus cured as He *came nigh* to Jericho; Mark gives this man's name, *Bartimeus;* according to his account, it was as Jesus *went out* of Jericho that He healed him; finally, Matthew speaks of *two* blind men, who were healed as Jesus *departed* from the city. The three accounts harmonize, as in so many cases, only in the words of the dialogue; the tenor of the sufferer's prayer and of the reply of Jesus is almost identical in the three (ver. 38 and parallel). Of those three narratives, that of Mark is undoubtedly the most exact and picturesque; and in the case of a real difference, it is to this evangelist that we must give the preference. It has been observed, however (Andreæ *Beweis des Glaubens*, July and August 1870), that Josephus and Eusebius distinguished between the old and the new Jericho, and that the two blind men might have been found, the one as they went out of the one city, the other at the entrance of the other. Or, indeed, it is not impossible that two cures took place on that day, the one on the occasion of their entrance into the city, the other on their leaving it, which Matthew has combined; Luke applying to the one, following a tradition slightly altered, the special details which had characterized the other. This

[1] Ver. 35. ℵ. B. D. L., ἐπαιτων instead of προσαιτων.—Ver. 38. A. E. K. Π. 10 Mnn. omit Ιησου.—Ver. 39. B. D. L. P. X. some Mnn., σιγησαι instead of σιωπησει.—Ver. 41. ℵ. B. D. L. X. omit λεγων before τι.

double modification might have been the more easily introduced into the oral narrative, if Jesus, coming from Ephraim to Jericho, entered the city, as is very probable, by the same road and by the same gate by which He left it to go to Jerusalem. If there were two blind men, they might then have been healed almost on the same spot.—The name *Bartimeus* (*son of Timeus*), which Mark has preserved, comes either from the Greek name Τιμαῖος, *the honourable*, or from the Aramaic, *same, samia, blind;* blind, son of the blind (Hitzig, Keim). Mark adds: *the blind man.* The term suggests the name by which he was known in the place.

The address, *son of David*, is a form of undisguised Messianic worship. This utterance would suffice to show the state of men's minds at that time. The rebuke addressed to him by the members of the company (ver. 39) has no bearing whatever on the use of this title. It seems to them much rather that there is presumption on the part of a beggar in thus stopping the progress of so exalted a personage.—The reading of the T. R., σιωπήσῃ, is probably taken from the parallels. We must read, with the Alex.: σιγήσῃ (a term more rarely used).—Nothing could be more natural than the sudden change which is effected in the conduct of the multitude, as soon as they observe the favourable disposition of Jesus; they form so many inimitable characteristics preserved by Mark only. With a majesty truly royal, Jesus seems to open up to the beggar the treasures of divine power: "What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?" and to give him, if we may so speak, *carte blanche* (v. 41).

In replying to the blind man's prayer, ver. 42, He says, *thy faith*, not, *my power*, to impress on him the value of that disposition, in view of the still more important spiritual miracle which remains to be wrought in him, and, *hath saved thee*, not, *hath made thee whole;* although his life was in no danger, to show him that in this cure there lies the beginning of his salvation, if he will keep up the bond of faith between him and the Saviour's person. Jesus allows Bartimeus to give full scope to his gratitude, and the crowd to express aloud their admiration and joy. The time for cautious measures is past. Those feelings to which the multitude give themselves up are the breath preceding that anticipation of Pentecost

which is called Palm Day. Δοξάζειν relates to the power, αἰνεῖν to the goodness of God (ii. 20).

The undeniable superiority of Mark's narrative obliges Bleek to give up here, at least in part, his untenable position of regarding Mark as the compiler of the two others. He acknowledges, that even while using the narrative of the other two, he must have had in this case a separate and independent source. So far well; but is it possible that this source absolutely contained nothing more than this one narrative?

Holtzmann, on the other hand, who regards the proto-Mark as the origin of the three Syn., finds it no less impossible to explain how Matthew and Luke could so completely alter the historical side of the account (the one: *two* blind men instead of one; the other: the healing *before* entering Jericho rather than after, etc.), and to spoil at will its dramatic beauty, so well reproduced by Mark. And what signifies the explanation given by Holtzmann of Luke's transposition of the miracle, and which is borrowed from Bleek: that Luke has been led by the succeeding history of Zaccheus to place the healing *before* the entrance into Jericho!

Volkmar, who derives Luke from Mark, and Matthew from the two combined, alleges that Mark intended the blind man to be the type of the Gentiles who seek the Saviour (hence the name Bartimeus; Timeus comes, according to him, from *Thima, the unclean*); and the company who followed Him, and who wish to impose silence on the man, to be types of the Judeo-Christians, who denied to the Gentiles access to the Messiah of Israel. If Luke omits the most picturesque details, it is because of his *prosaic character*. If he omits the name Bartimeus, it is because he is offended at finding the Gentiles designated as impure beings. If he places the miracle *before* entering Jericho, it is because he distinguishes the healing of *the man* from that of his paganism, which shall be placed *after*, and that in the salvation granted to Zaccheus.[1] Zaccheus, *the pure*, is the counterpart of Timeus, *the unclean* (*Die Evangel.* pp. 502–505). Of its kind this is the climax! Such is the game of *hide and seek* which the evangelists played with the Churches on the theme of the person of Jesus! After this we need give no other proofs of this author's sagacity.

8. *Jesus at the House of Zaccheus:* xix. 1–10.—Vers. 1–10.[2] In Matthew and Mark, the account of Jesus' entry into

[1] It might be thought that we are jesting. Here are the words: "The blind mendicant of Mark is cleft by Luke into two halves: (*a*) The blind man as such, whom he places before the entrance of Jericho; (*b*) the pagan element in the blind man, which is placed after leaving Jericho (in Zaccheus)."

[2] Ver. 2. D. G. 7 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit καλουμενος.—א. L. Syr^{cur}. omit ουτος between και and ην.—B. K. Π. some Mnn. It^{aliq}. Vg. omit ην.—Ver. 4. The Mss. are divided between προδραμων (T. R. and Alex.) and προσδραμων (Byz. and 25 Mnn.).—א. B. L. add τις το before εμπροσθεν.—Instead of δι' εκεινης, which

Jerusalem immediately follows that of the healing of Bartimeus. There is a blank left by them, for Jesus stayed at Bethany, and there passed at least one night (John xii. 1 et seq.). This blank, according to Luke, is still more considerable. For before arriving at Bethany, Jesus stopped at Jericho, and there passed the night (ver. 5). Luke's source is original, and independent of the other two Syn. It was Aramaic, as is proved by the heaping up of *καί*, the paratactic form, as well as the expression *ὀνόματι καλούμενος*, vers. 1, 2. Comp. i. 61.—The name *Zaccheus*, from זכך, *to be pure*, proves the Jewish origin of the man.—There must have been at Jericho one of the principal custom-houses, both on account of the exportation of the balm which grew in that oasis, and which was sold in all countries of the world, and on account of the considerable traffic which took place on this road, by which lay the route from Peræa to Judæa and Egypt. Zaccheus was at the head of the office. The person of Jesus attracted his peculiar interest, no doubt because he had heard tell of the benevolence shown by this Prophet to people of his class. Most certainly *τίς ἐστί* (ver. 3) does not signify: *which* of the members *of the company* He was (Bleek), but: what was His appearance. After having accompanied the crowd for a little, without gaining his end, he outruns it.

The sycamore is a tree with low horizontal branches, and consequently of easy assent. *Ἐκείνης*, for: *δι' ἐκείνης ὁδοῦ* (ver. 19). Was the attention of Jesus called to his presence in the tree by the looks which the people directed toward him? Did He, at the same time, hear His name pronounced in the crowd? In this case, it is unnecessary to regard the address of Jesus as the effect of supernatural knowledge. There is something of pleasantness, and even of sprightliness, in the form: "*Make haste and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house.*" The word *must* indicates that Jesus has recognised in him, on account of this eager desire which he has to see him, the host whom His Father has chosen for Him at Jericho. Here there is a lost sheep to be found. It is the same unwearied conviction of His mission as in meeting with the Samaritan woman.

T. R. reads with A. and 2 Mnn. only, all the others, *ἐκείνης*.—Ver. 5. ℵ. B. L. omit the words *ἰδὼν αὐτὸν καὶ*.—Ver. 8. G. K. M. Π. several Mnn., *κύριον* instead of *Ἰησοῦν*.—Ver. 9. ℵ* L. R. omit *ἐστιν* after *Ἀβραάμ*.

What absolute consecration to the divine work! And what sovereign independence of human opinion! In the multitude, which is yet swayed by pharisaic prejudices, there is general discontent. There is nothing to show that the disciples are also included under the words: "They *all* murmured." The expression σταθεὶς δέ, "*but* Zaccheus *standing*" (before the Lord, ver. 8), immediately connects the following words of the publican with those popular murmurs. Σταθείς denotes a firm and dignified attitude, such as suits a man whose honour is attacked. "He whom Thou hast thought good to choose as Thy host, is not, as is alleged, a being unworthy of Thy choice." Did Zaccheus pronounce the words of ver. 8 at the time when Jesus had just come under his roof? This is what we should be led to suppose at the first glance by the words: *but he stood;* nevertheless, this movement on the part of Zaccheus would appear a little hasty, and the answer of Jesus: *Salvation is come* (ver. 9), proves that He had already sojourned for a time with His host. Was it, then, at the moment when Jesus was resuming His journey (Schleiermacher, Olshausen)? Vers. 11 and 28 may support this supposition. But the word *to-day* (ver. 9), which recalls the *to-day* of ver. 5, places this dialogue on the very day of His arrival. The most suitable time appears to be that of the evening meal, while Jesus converses peacefully with His host and the numerous guests. Unless the terms of vers. 11 and 28 are immoderately pressed, they are not opposed to this view.

Most modern interpreters take the words of Zaccheus as a vow inspired by his gratitude for the grace which he has just experienced. Ἰδού, *behold,* is taken to indicate a sudden resolution: "Take note of this resolution: From this moment I give . . . , and I pledge myself to restore . . ." But if the pres. *I give* may certainly apply to a gift which Zaccheus makes at the instant once for all, the pres. *I restore fourfold* seems rather to designate a rule of conduct already admitted and long practised by him. It is unnatural to apply it to a measure which would relate only to some special cases of injustice to be repaired in the future. Ἰδού, *behold,* is in keeping with the unexpected revelation, so far as the public are concerned, in this rule of Zaccheus, till then unknown by all, and which he now reveals, only to show the injustice of those

murmurs with which the course of Jesus is met. "Thou hast not brought contempt on Thyself by accepting me as Thy host, publican though I am; and it is no ill-gotten gain with which I entertain Thee." In this sense, the σταθεὶς δέ, *but he stood*, is fully intelligible. By the half of his goods, Zaccheus, of course, understands the half of his yearly income. In the case of a wrong done to a neighbour, the law exacted, when restitution was voluntary, a fifth over and above the sum taken away (Num. v. 6, 7). Zaccheus went vastly further. Perhaps the restitution which he imposed on himself was that forcibly exacted from the detected thief. In a profession like his, it was easy to commit involuntary injustices. Besides, Zaccheus had under his authority many employés for whom he could not answer.

Jesus accepts this apology of Zaccheus, which indeed has its worth in reply to the murmurs of the crowd; and without allowing the least meritorious value to those restitutions and those extraordinary almsgivings, He declares that Zaccheus is the object of divine grace as much as those can be who accuse him. His entrance into his house has brought salvation thither. Notwithstanding the words, "*Jesus said unto him . . .*," the words following are addressed not to Zaccheus, but to the entire assembly. The πρὸς αὐτόν, *unto him*, therefore signifies: with His eyes turned upon him as the subject of His answer; comp. vii. 44. Jesus is the living salvation. Received as He was into the house, He brought into it by His very presence this heavenly blessing. Καθότι, *agreeably to the fact that* (for so much as), indicates the reason why Jesus can assert that Zaccheus is saved this day. But is this reason the fact that Zaccheus is a descendant of Abraham according to the flesh, and has preserved this characteristic as much as any other Jew, notwithstanding his Rabbinical excommunication? No; Jesus could not make the possibility of salvation dependent on the naked characteristic of being a member of the Israelitish nation. This idea would be in contradiction to His whole teaching, and to the very saying which concludes this verse. The term, *son of Abraham*, must therefore be taken in its spiritual sense: "Zaccheus is restored to this character which he had lost by his excommunication. He possesses it in a still higher sense than that in which he had lost it."—

Ver. 10. *Lost,* so far as a son of Abraham according to the flesh; but *found* (he, the same one, καὶ αὐτός), as a son of Abraham according to the spirit. Thus the maxim of ver. 10 readily connects itself with ver. 9.

According to Hilgenfeld (p. 206), this piece is not in the least Pauline; it belongs to the ancient Ebionite source. According to Holtzmann, on the contrary (p. 234), it is entirely Luke's. It may be seen how critics agree with one another on questions of this sort! As concerns ourselves, we have established an Aramaic source. On the other hand, we are at one with Holtzmann in acknowledging the traces of Luke's style (καθότι, ver. 9; ἡλικία, ver. 3; ἐκείνης, ver. 4; διαγογγύζειν, ver. 7). Hence we conclude that Luke himself translated into Greek this account, which is taken from an Aramaic document.

9. *The Parable of the Pounds:* xix. 11–27. — Ver. 11. *The Introduction.*—We have already observed in the multitudes (xiv. 25, xviii. 38, xix. 1–3), and even in the disciples (xviii. 31; comp. with Matt. xx. 20 et seq.), the traces of an excited state. Ver. 11 shows that it went on increasing as they approached Jerusalem. The profound calmness and self-possession of Jesus contrasts with the agitation which is produced around Him.—The words ἀκουόντων αὐτῶν, "*as they heard these things,*" and προσθεὶς εἶπε, "*He added, and spake,*" establish a close relation between the parable of the pounds and the preceding conversation. But we need not conclude therefrom that this parable was uttered *as a continuation* of the conversation. It may, indeed, have been so merely in respect of time (ver. 28). The relation indicated by the introduction is purely moral: the so striking contrast between the conduct of Jesus toward Zaccheus, and the generally received ideas, was such that every one felt that a decisive crisis was near. The new was on the eve of appearing; and this imminent revolution naturally presented itself to the imagination of all in the form in which it had always been described to them. The word παραχρῆμα, *immediately,* stands first in the proposition, because it expresses the thought against which the parable following is directed. The verb ἀναφαίνεσθαι, *to appear,* answers well to the great spectacle for which they were looking.—That Luke himself deduced this introduction from the contents of the parable, as Weizsäcker supposes, is not impossible. But up to this point we have too often recog-

nised the historical value of those short introductions, not to admit that Luke's source, from which he took the parable, contained some indication of the circumstances which had called it forth.

Vers. 12–14.[1] *The Probation.*—A man of noble birth goes to ask from the sovereign of the country which he inhabits the government of his province. Before undertaking this journey, which must be a long one,—for the sovereign dwells in a distant country,—this man, concerned about the future administration of the state after his return, puts to the proof the servants who have till now formed his own household, and whom he proposes afterwards to make his officers. For that purpose, he confides to each of them a sum of money, to be turned to account in his absence. Hereby he will be able to estimate their fidelity and capability, and to assign them in the new state of things a place proportioned to the qualities of which they shall have given proof. Meanwhile the future subjects protest before the sovereign against the elevation of their fellow-citizen. Some features in this picture seem borrowed from the political situation of the Holy Land Josephus relates that on the death of Herod the Great, Archelaus, his son, whom he had appointed his heir, repaired to Rome to request that Augustus would invest him in his father's dominions, but that the Jews, wearied of this dynasty of adventurers, begged the emperor rather to convert their country into a Roman province. This case might the more readily occur to the mind of Jesus, as at that very Jericho where He was speaking there stood the magnificent palace which this Archelaus had built.—The word εὐγενής, *of noble birth,* evidently refers to the superhuman nature of Jesus.—*Μακράν* is an adverb, as at xv. 13. This far distance is the emblem of the long interval which, in the view of Jesus, was to separate His departure from His return.

The expression, *to receive a kingdom,* includes the installation of Jesus in His heavenly power, as well as the preparation of His Messianic kingdom here below by the sending of the Holy Spirit and His work in the Church.—A *mina,* among the Hebrews, was worth about £6 sterling.[2] It is

[1] Ver. 13. 8 Mjj. 20 Mnn. Or. read ἐν ᾧ instead of ἕως.

[2] Keil, *Handb. der Bibl. Archäologie,* vol. ii. p. 144.

not, as in Matt. xxv. 14, *all his goods* which the master distributes; the sum, too, is much less considerable; the *talents* of which Matthew speaks are each worth about £400. The idea is therefore different. In Luke, the money entrusted is simply a means of testing. In Matthew, the matter in question is the administration of the owner's fortune. The sums entrusted, being in Luke the same for all the servants, represent not *gifts* (χαρίσματα), which are very various, but the grace of salvation common to all believers (pardon and the Holy Spirit). The position of every believer in the future kingdom depends on the use which he makes of that grace here below. It is surprising to hear Jesus call this salvation an ἐλάχιστον, *a very little* (ver. 17). What an idea of future glory is given to us by this saying! The Alex. reading ἐν ᾧ, ver. 13, assumes that ἔρχομαι has the meaning of *travelling*; while with ἕως it would signify *to arrive*. The first reading implies that the time during which the absence of Jesus lasts is a *constant returning*, which is perfectly in keeping with the biblical view. "I say unto you, that *from this time* ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the throne . . ., *and coming in the clouds of heaven*," Matt. xxvi. 64. The ascension is the first step in His return here below. Ver. 14 describes the resistance of the Jews to the Messianic sovereignty of Jesus, and that during all the time which separates His first from His second coming.

Vers. 15–19.[1] *The faithful Servants.*—From ver. 15 onwards Jesus depicts what will happen at the Parousia. Every servant will share in the power of his master, now become king, in a degree proportioned to his activity during the time of his probation (the reign of grace). While the means of action had been the same, the results differ; the amount of power committed to each will therefore also differ in the same proportion. It is entirely otherwise in Matthew. The sums committed were different; the results are equal in so far as they are proportioned to the sums received; there is therefore here equality of faithfulness and equal testimony of satisfaction. Everything in Matthew's representation turns on the

[1] Ver. 15. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. Or., δἰδωκει instead of ἐδωκεν.—ℵ. B. D. L. Syr^{cur}. Or., τι διεπραγματευσαντο instead of τις τι διεπραγματευσατο.—Ver. 17. B. D. 3 Mnn. Or., ινγι instead of ιυ.

personal relation of the servants to their master, whose fortune (ver. 14, *his* goods) they are commissioned to administer and increase, and who rejoices equally in the active fidelity of all; while in Luke the one point in question is to settle the *position* of the servants in the economy of glory which is opening, and consequently to determine the proportion of faithfulness displayed during the time of labour and probation which has just closed.—The *ten*, the *five cities* (vers. 17 and 19), represent moral beings in a lower state of development, but whom the glorified faithful are commissioned to raise to their divine destination.

Vers. 20–27.[1] Of the other seven servants there is no mention; they fall either into the category of the preceding, or into that of the following. The ground on which the latter explains his inactivity is not a mere pretext. His language is too plain-spoken not to be sincere. He is a believer who has not found the state of grace offered by Jesus so brilliant as he hoped,—a legal Christian, who has not tasted grace, and knows nothing of the gospel but its severe morality. It seems to him that the Lord gives very little to exact so much. With such a feeling, the least possible only will be done. God should be satisfied with us if we abstain from doing ill, from squandering our talent. Such would have been the language of a Judas dissatisfied with the poverty of Christ's spiritual kingdom. In Matthew, the unfaithful servant is offended not at the insufficiency of the master's gifts in general, but at the inferiority of those given to himself, in comparison with those of his associates. This is a Judas embittered at the sight of the higher position assigned to Peter or John.

The master's answer (ver. 22) is an *argumentum ad hominem:* The more thou knowest that I am austere, the more shouldest thou have endeavoured to satisfy me! The Christian who lacks the sweet experience of grace ought to be the most anxious of labourers. The fear of doing ill is no reason for doing nothing, especially when there are means of action,

[1] Ver. 20. ℵᶜ. B. D. L. R. 2 Mnn., *ο στιρος* instead of *στιρος*.—Ver. 22. 9 Mjj. omit *δι* after *λεγει*.—Ver. 23. All the Mjj. except K. omit *την* before *τραπεζαν*.—Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L. 7 Mnn. omit *γαρ* after *λεγω*.—ℵ. B. L. 7 Mnn. omit *απ' αυτου* after *αρθησεται*.—Ver. 27. The Mss. are divided between *εκεινους* (T. R., Byz.) and *τουτους* (Alex.).—ℵ. B. F. L. R. some Mnn. Syr. add *αυτους* after *κατασφαξατε*.

the use of which covers our entire responsibility. What does Jesus mean by the *banker?* Could it be those Christian associations to which every believer may entrust the resources which he cannot use himself? It seems to us that Jesus by this image would rather represent the divine omnipotence of which we may avail ourselves by prayer, without thereby exposing the cause of Christ to any risk. Of him who has not worked the Lord will ask, Hast thou at least prayed?—The dispensation of glory changes in the case of such a servant into an eternity of loss and shame. The holy works which he might have wrought here below, along with the powers by which he might have accomplished them, are committed to the servant who has shown himself the most active. This or that pagan population, for example, which might have been evangelized by the young Christian who remained on the earth the slave of selfish ease, shall be committed in the future dispensation to the devoted missionary who has used his powers here below in the service of Jesus.—At ver. 26, the same form of address as at xii. 41, 42. The Lord continues as if no observation had been interposed, replying all the while, nevertheless, to the objection which has been started. There is a law, in virtue of which every grace actively appropriated increases our receptivity for higher graces, while all grace rejected diminishes our aptitude for receiving new graces. From this law of moral life it follows, that gradually all graces must be concentrated in faithful workers, and be withdrawn from negligent servants. Chap. viii. 18, Jesus said, *That which he seemeth to have;* here he says, *That he hath.* The two expressions are true. We *have* a grace which is bestowed on us; but if we do not assimilate it actively, we do not really possess it; we imagine we have it.

Ver. 27 (comp. ver. 14) represents the Messiah's reckoning with the Jewish people, as vers. 15–26 represent His reckoning with the Church. *Πλήν, only:* "After judging the servants, *there remains only* one thing." This punishment of the Jews includes, along with the destruction of Jerusalem, the state of rejection in which they are plunged till the Lord's return.

The ruling idea of this parable in Luke is therefore that of a time of probation between the departure and the return of

the Lord, necessary to prepare the sentence which shall fix the position of every one in the state of things following the Parousia. Hence follows the impossibility of that immediate appearing of the kingdom of God which filled the minds of the crowd now accompanying Jesus to Jerusalem. Luke's parable thus forms, as Holtzmann acknowledges, a complete whole; and whatever the same learned critic may say, it must be confessed that the introduction, ver. 11, indicates its true bearing,—a fact confirming the idea that this introduction belonged to Luke's sources, and proceeded from accurate tradition.

The relation between this parable and that of the talents in Matthew is difficult to determine. Strauss has alleged that Luke's was a combination of that of the *husbandmen* (Luke xx.) and that of the *talents* (Matt. xxv.). But the internal harmony of Luke's description, which Holtzmann acknowledges, does not admit of this supposition. Meyer regards it as a re-handling of the parable of the talents in Matthew. The action is undoubtedly similar, but, as we have seen, the thought is radically different. The aim of Matthew's parable seems to be to encourage those who have received less, by promising them the same approbation from the Master if they are equally faithful, and by putting them on their guard against the temptation of making their inferiority a motive to spiritual indifference, and a pretext for idleness. We have seen that the idea of the parable in Luke is quite different. It must therefore be admitted that there were two parables uttered, but that their images were borrowed from very similar fields of life. The analogy between the two descriptions may perhaps have caused the importation of some details from the one into the other (*e.g.* the dialogue between the master and the unfaithful servant).

Here we have reached the end of that journey, the account of which begins ix. 51. Jesus first traversed the countries lying south from the old scene of His activity, then the border regions of Samaria and Galilee, finally Peræa; He has thus come to the gates of Jerusalem. From the moral point of view, His work also has reached a new stage. On the one hand, the enthusiasm of the people is at its height, and all believing Galilee, the nucleus of His future Church in Israel, accompanies Him to form His retinue when He shall make His kingly entry into His capital; on the other, He has completely broken with the pharisaic party, and His separation from the nation as such, swayed by the pharisaic spirit, is consummated. He must die; for to let Him live would, on the part of the Sanhedrim, be to abdicate.

We have not followed step by step Keim's criticism on this last part of the journey. It is the masterpiece of arbitrariness. Whatever does not square with the proportions of Jesus as settled beforehand by the learned critic, is eliminated for one reason or another. Those reasons are found without difficulty when sought. After John, Luke is the most abused. For Matthew's two blind men he substitutes one, because he thinks right to reproduce the other in the form of the person of Zaccheus. Timeus (*the impure*) becomes Zaccheus (*the pure*), the impure pure! Mark replaces the second by Timeus, the father (also blind) of Bartimeus! Keim here reaches the height of Volkmar.—The blindness is overcome by the power of enthusiasm which was reigning at the moment, and which, by exalting the force of the vital nervous fluid, reopens the closed eyes temporarily or lastingly! Luke invents, in the despised person of Zaccheus, a counterpart to proud Jerusalem, which *knows not the day of her visitation* (xix. 42). It is true that this last expression of Jesus, as well as His tears over Jerusalem, with which it is connected, is invented, as much as the history of Zaccheus. The two counterparts are imaginary!

FIFTH PART.

SOJOURN AT JERUSALEM.

CHAP. XIX. 28–XXI. 38.

THIS part includes three principal events: I. The entry of Jesus into Jerusalem (xix. 28–44). II. The exercise of His Messianic sovereignty in the temple (xix. 45–xxi. 4). III. The prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish people (xxi. 5–38).—The relation between these three events is easily understood. The first is the final appeal of Jesus to His people; with the second there is connected the decisive rejection of Israel; the third is, as it were, the pronouncing of the sentence which falls on this refusal.

FIRST CYCLE.—CHAP. XIX. 28–44.

The Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem.

This narrative embraces: 1*st.* The preparations for the entry (vers. 28–36); 2*d.* The joy of the disciples and of the multitude on coming in sight of Jerusalem (vers. 37–40); 3*d.* The tears of Jesus at the same instant (vers. 41–44).

1*st.* Vers. 28–36.[1] *The Preparations for the Entry.*—The connection indicated by the words, *while thus speaking, He went,* is rather moral than of time: "while speaking thus [of the unbelief of Israel], He nevertheless continued His journey

[1] Ver. 29. Marcion omitted all the piece, vers. 29–46.—א. B. L. some Mnn. omit αυτου after μαθητων.—Ver. 30. א. B. D. L. 3 Mnn. Or., λεγων instead of ειπων.—B. D. L. add και before λυσαντες.—Ver. 31. 6 Mjj. 3 Mnn. It^{aliq}. Or. omit αυτω after ειπατε.

(imperf. ἐπορεύετο) to Jerusalem." Ἔμπροσθεν signifies not *in advance* (εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν), but *before* [His disciples], at their head. Comp. Mark x. 32: "*They were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them, and they were amazed, and as they followed they were afraid.*"

According to John, while the great body of the caravan pursued its way to Jerusalem, Jesus stopped at Bethany, where a feast was prepared for Him, and where He passed one or even two nights; and it was after this stay that He solemnly entered the capital, where the rumour of His approach had already spread. These circumstances fully explain the scene of Palm Day, which in the synoptical account comes upon us somewhat abruptly. Bleek finds a certain obscurity in Luke's expression: "When He came nigh *to Bethphage and Bethany;*" for it is not known how those two localities are related. In Mark (xi. 1) the same difficulty (Matt. xxi. 1 does not speak of Bethany). Add to this that the O. T. nowhere speaks of a village called Bethphage, and that tradition, which indicates the site of Bethany so certainly, says absolutely nothing about that of this hamlet. The Talmud alone mentions Bethphage, and in such a way as to show that this locality was very near Jerusalem, and was even joined to the city. Bethphage is without the walls, it is said; and the bread which is prepared in it is sacred, like that which is made in the city (*Bab. Pesachim*, 63. 2; *Menachoth*, 7. 6, etc.). Lightfoot, Renan, Caspari[1] have concluded from these passages that Bethphage was not a hamlet, but a district, the precinct of the city extending eastward as far as the Mount of Olives, and even to Bethany. According to the Rabbins, Jerusalem was to the people what *the camp* had formerly been to Israel in the wilderness. And as at the great feasts the city could not contain all the pilgrims who came from a distance, and who should strictly have found an abode *in the camp* (the city), and there celebrated the feast, there was added, they say, to Jerusalem, to make it sufficient, all this district situated on the side of the Mount of Olives, and which bore the name of *Bethphage* (*place of figs*). Bethany was the beginning of this district where the pilgrims encamped in a mass; and perhaps its name came from *Beth-Chani, place*

[1] *Chronol. geograph. Einleitung in das Leben Jesu*, 1869, pp. 161 and 162.

of booths (the merchants' tents set up in the sight of this multitude) (Caspari, p. 163). Nothing could in this case be more exact than the mode of expression used by Luke and Mark: *when He came to Bethphage* (the sacred district) *and to Bethany* (the hamlet where this district began).—Ἐλαιῶν might be taken as the gen. plural of ἐλαία, *olive trees* (ἐλαιῶν). But in Josephus this word is the name of the mountain itself (ἐλαιών, *olive wood*); comp. also Acts i. 12. This is the most probable sense in our passage. At ver. 37 and xxii. 39, where Luke uses this word in the first sense, he indicates it by the art. τῶν.

The sending of the two disciples proves the deliberate intention of Jesus to give a certain solemnity to this scene. Till then He had withdrawn from popular expressions of homage; but once at least He wished to show Himself as King Messiah to His people (ver. 40). It was a last call addressed by Him to the population of Jerusalem (ver. 42). This course, besides, could no longer compromise His work. He knew that in any case death awaited Him in the capital. —John (xii. 14) says simply, Jesus *found* the young ass, without indicating in what way. But the words which follow, "The disciples remembered that they had done these things unto Him," ver. 16, allude to a *doing* on the part of the disciples which John himself has not mentioned. His account, therefore, far from contradicting that of the Syn., assumes it as true.—The remark, *whereon yet never man sat* (ver. 30), is in keeping with the kingly and Messianic use which is about to be made of the animal. Comp. Deut. xxi. 3. Matthew not only mentions the colt, but also the ass. Accompanied by its mother, the animal, though not broken in, would go the more quietly. What are we to think of the critics (Strauss, Volkmar) who allege that, according to Matthew's text, Jesus mounted the two animals *at once!*—The ease with which Jesus obtains the use of this beast, which does not belong to Him, is another trait of the royal greatness which He thinks good to display on this occasion.—Οὕτως, ver. 31 (Mark and Matthew, εὐθέως), "*thus;* and that will suffice." Luke and Mark do not cite the prophecy of Zechariah. It was not necessary that every one should understand the symbolical meaning of this scene, and contrast the peaceful beast with

the warlike steeds of earthly conquerors.—A new proof of the supernatural knowledge of Jesus, which must not be confounded with omniscience; comp. xxii. 10, 31–34; John i. 49, iv. 17, etc. According to Mark, who loves to describe details, the colt was tied to a door *at a crossway* (ἄμφοδος). It was no doubt the place where the little path leading to the house of the owners of the ass went off from the highway; or might it be the *crossing* of two roads, that which Jesus followed (going from east to west), and that which to the present day passes along the crest of the mountain (from north to south)?—The term κύριος, *Lord* (ver. 34), shows the feeling of sovereignty with which Jesus acted. It is probable that He knew the owners. In substituting their garments for the cover which it would have been so easy to procure, the disciples wished to pay homage to Jesus,—a fact brought out by the pron. ἑαυτῶν (ver. 35). Comp. 2 Kings ix. 13.

2*d.* Vers. 37–40.[1] *The Entry.*—From the moment that Jesus seats Himself on the colt, He becomes the visible centre of the assemblage, and the scene takes a character more and more extraordinary. It is as if a breathing from above had all at once taken possession of this multitude. The sight of the city and temple which opens up at the moment contributes to this burst of joy and hope (ver. 37). The object of ἐγγίζοντος, *coming nigh*, is not πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει (πρὸς τήν would be necessary); it is rather Jerusalem, the true goal of the journey. Πρὸς τῇ is a qualification of ἤρξαντο: "*at the descent*, they began." From this elevated point, 300 feet above the terrace of the temple, which is itself raised about 140 feet above the level of the valley of the Cedron, an extensive view was had of the city and the whole plain which it commands, especially of the temple, which rose opposite, immediately above the valley. All those hearts recall at this moment the miracles which have distinguished the career of this extraordinary man; they are aware that at the point to which things have come His entry into Jerusalem

[1] Ver. 37. The Mss. are divided between ἠρξαντο and ἤρξατο.—B. D., παντων instead of πασων.—Ver. 38. Instead of ὁ ἐρχομενος βασιλευς, which T. R. reads, ℵ* Π. ὁ βασιλευς, D. Λ. some Mnn. It^{alliq}. ὁ ἐρχομενος.—Ver. 40. ℵ. B. L. omit αυτοις.—ℵ. B. L., κραξουσιν instead of κεκραξονται.

cannot fail to issue in a decisive revolution, although they form an utterly false idea of that catastrophe.

John informs us that among all those miracles there was one especially which excited the enthusiasm of the crowd; that was the resurrection of Lazarus. Already on the previous evening very many pilgrims had come from Jerusalem to Bethany to see not only Jesus, but also Lazarus, who had been raised from the dead. This day the procession meets at every step with new troops arriving from the city; and these successive meetings call forth ever and again new bursts of joy.—The acclamation, ver. 38, is taken in part from Ps. cxviii. 25. This hymn belonged to the great Hallel, which was chanted at the end of the Paschal Supper as well as at the feast of Tabernacles. The people were accustomed to apply the expression, *He who cometh in the name of the Lord* (in the Psalm, every faithful one who came to the feast), to the Messiah. Probably the word *βασιλεύς, king,* is authentic in Luke; and its omission in some MSS. arises from the texts of the LXX. and of Matthew.—The expression, *in the name of,* is dependent not on *blessed be;* but on *He who cometh:* "the King who comes on the part of God as His representative." The *peace in heaven* is that of the reconciliation which the Messiah comes to effect between God and the earth. Luke omits the word *Hosanna,* which his readers of Gentile origin would not have understood.

The fact related vers. 39 and 40 belongs to Luke alone. Pharisees had mingled with the groups, to spy out what was passing. Aware that their authority is slipping from them (John xii. 19), they had recourse to Jesus Himself, begging Him to keep order in His crowd of followers. They are disgusted at seeing that, not content with setting Himself up as a prophet, He dares publicly to accept Messianic homage. The saying, *Rebuke thy disciples,* was doubtless accompanied with an irritated and anxious look towards the citadel of Antonia, the residence of the Roman garrison. This look seemed to say: "Seest thou not . . . ? Are not the Romans there? Wilt thou destroy us?" The answer of Jesus has a terrible majesty: "If I should silence all those mouths, you would hear the same acclamations proceeding from the ground! So impossible is it that an appearance like this

should not be, once at least, saluted on the earth as it deserves to be!" — The terms used appear to have been proverbial (Hab. ii. 11). Some have referred the term, *the stones*, to the walls of the temple, and of the houses of Jerusalem, which, as they fell in ruins forty years after, rendered homage to the kingly glory of Jesus; but this meaning is far-fetched. The form of the Paulo-post future (κεκράξονται) is frequently used by the LXX., but, as here, without having the special signification which is attached to it in classical Greek. The grammatical reduplication simply expresses the repetition of the cry of those inanimate objects: "It will be impossible to reduce those stones to silence, if once they shall begin to cry." The simple future in the Alex. is a correction.

3*d*. Vers. 41–44.[1] *The Lamentations of Jesus.*—Jesus has reached the edge of the plateau (ὡς ἤγγισεν); the holy city lies before His view (ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν). What a day would it be for it, if the bandage fell from its eyes! But what has just passed between Him and the Pharisees present has awakened in His heart the conviction of the insurmountable resistance which He is about to meet. Then Jesus, seized, and, as it were, wrung by the contrast between what is and what might be, breaks out into sobs. Ἔκλαυσεν, not ἐδάκρυσεν; we have to do with lamentations, with sobbings, not with tears. The words *even thou* mark a contrast between the population of Jerusalem and that multitude of believers from Galilee and abroad which formed His retinue. Would the inhabitants of Jerusalem but associate themselves with this Messianic festival, their capital would be saved! From that very day would date the glory of Jerusalem, as well as that of its King.—The two words καίγε and σοῦ, omitted by the Alex., have great importance. "Καίγε, *at least* in this day, thy last day." This *one* day which remains to it would suffice to secure its pardon for all the unbelief of the city, and even for all the blood of the prophets formerly shed within its walls! Does not this word *at least* suppose previous resi-

[1] Ver. 41. The Mss. are divided between επ' αυτη (T. R., Byz.) and επ' αυτην (Alex.).—Ver. 42. ℵ. B. L. Or., ει εγνως εν τη ημερα ταυτη και συ instead of ει εγνως και συ καιγε εν τη ημερα σου ταυτη.—ℵ. B. L. omit σου after ειρηνην.—Ver. 43. ℵ. C. L., παριμβαλουσιν instead of περιβαλουσιν.—Ver. 44. The Mss. are divided between επι λιθω (T. R.) and επι λιθον.

dences of Jesus at Jerusalem? Σοῦ, added to ἡμέρα (*thy* day), alludes to the days, now past, of Capernaum, Bethsaïda, and Chorazin. Jesus does not knock indefinitely at the door of a heart or of a people.—In the words, *the things which belong to thy peace*, Jesus thinks at once of the individual salvation of the inhabitants and of the preservation of the entire city. By submitting to the sovereignty of Jesus, Israel would have been preserved from the spirit of carnal exaltation which led to its ruin.—The apodosis of, *Oh if . . .*, is understood, as at xiii. 9.—By the νῦν δέ, *but now*, Jesus reverts from this ideal salvation which He has been contemplating to the sad reality. We must beware of taking, with some commentators, as the subject of ἐκρύβη, *are hid*, the whole of the following clause: "it is concealed from thine eyes that . . ." The sentence thus read would drag intolerably.

Instead of the days of deliverance and glory, the image of which has just passed before His mind, Jesus sees others approaching, which fill His soul with sadness (vers. 43 and 44). Modern criticism agrees in asserting that this description of the destruction of Jerusalem in Luke includes particulars so precise, that it could only have been given *ab eventu*. It therefore concludes confidently from this passage that our Gospel was composed after this catastrophe. But in this case we must refuse to allow Jesus any supernatural knowledge, and relegate to the domain of myth or imposture all the facts of evangelical history in which it is implied, *e.g.* the announcement of Peter's denial, so well attested by the four Gospels. Besides, if it cannot be denied that the destruction of Jerusalem was foreseen and announced by Jesus, as is implied in His foreseeing the siege, is it not evident that all the particulars of the following description must have presented themselves spontaneously to His mind? We know well how Jesus loves to individualize His idea by giving the most concrete details of its realization. Comp. chap. xvii.—Χάραξ, a palisade of stakes filled in with branches and earth, and generally strengthened by a ditch, behind which the besiegers sheltered themselves. Such a rampart was really constructed by Titus. The Jews burned it in a sally; it was replaced by a wall.—In the LXX. ἐδαφίζειν signifies, *to dash on the ground*. But in good Greek it signifies, *to bring down to the*

level of the ground. The last sense suits better here, for it applies both to the houses levelled with the ground and to the slaughtered inhabitants. Jesus, like the Zechariah of the O. T. (Zech. xi.) and the Zacharias of the New (Luke i. 68), represents His coming as the last visit of God to His people. —The word καιρός, *the favourable time,* shows that this visit of God is this day reaching its close.

This account is one of the gems of our Gospel. After those arresting details, Luke does not even mention the entry into the city. The whole interest for him lies in the events which precede. Mark (xi. 11) and Matthew (xxi. 10) proceed otherwise. The latter sets himself to paint the emotion with which the whole city was seized. Mark (xi. 11) describes in a remarkable way the impressions of Jesus on the evening of the day. Accounts so different cannot be derived from the same written source.

SECOND CYCLE.—CHAP. XIX. 45–XXI. 4.

The Reign of Jesus in the Temple.

From this moment, Jesus establishes Himself as a sovereign in His Father's house; He there discharges the functions not only of a prophet, but of a legislator and judge; for some days the theocratic authorities seem to abdicate their powers into His hands.—These are the days of the Messiah's sovereignty in His temple (Mal. iii. 1, 2).

This section contains the following facts: Jesus driving out the sellers (xix. 45–48); His answer to an official question of the Sanhedrim regarding His competence (xx. 1–8); His announcing their deprivation of authority (xx. 9–19); His escape from the snares laid for Him by the Pharisees and Sadducees (xx. 20–26 and 27–40); His putting to them a question respecting the person of the Messiah (xx. 41–44); His guarding the people against those seducers (xx. 45–47); His setting up, in opposition to their false system of moral appreciation, the true standard of divine judgment (xxi. 1–4).

1. *Expulsion of the Sellers:* xix. 45–48.—Vers. 45–48.[1]

[1] Ver. 45. ℵ. B. C. L. 13 Mnn. Or. omit ἐν αὐτῷ after πωλοῦντας.—ℵ. B. L. 2 Mnn. Or. omit καὶ ἀγοράζοντας.—Ver. 46. ℵ. omits ἐστι. B. L. R. 9 Mnn. Or. add καὶ ἔσται before ὁ οἶκος, and reject ἐστιν.

Without Mark's narrative, we should think that the expulsion of the sellers took place on the day of the entry into Jerusalem. But from that evangelist, whose account is here peculiarly exact, we learn that the entry did not take place till towards the close of the day, and that on that evening the Lord did nothing but give Himself up to the contemplation of the temple. It was on the morrow, when He returned from Bethany, that He purified this place from the profanations which were publicly committed in it. If Matthew and Luke had had before them the account of the original Mark, how and why would they have altered it thus? Holtzmann supposes that Matthew intended by this transposition to connect the *Hosanna* of the children (related immediately afterwards) with the *Hosanna* of the multitude. The futility of this reason is obvious. And why and how should Luke, who does not relate the *Hosanna* of the children, introduce the same change into the common document, and that without having known Matthew's narrative!—The entry of Jesus into Jerusalem took place either on Sunday (*Comment. sur. l'évang. de Jean*, t. ii. pp. 371–373) or on the Monday; it would therefore be Monday or Tuesday morning when He drove out the sellers.—Stalls (חנויות) had been set up in the court of the Gentiles. There were sold the animals required as sacrifices; there pilgrims, who came from all countries of the world, found the coins of the country which they needed. There is nothing to prove that this exchange had to do with the didrachma which was paid for the temple.[1] The words καὶ ἀγοράζοντας, *and them that bought*, are perhaps borrowed from the other two Syn. But they may also have been omitted, in consequence of confounding the two endings ντας.—The saying of Jesus is taken from Isa. lvi. 7 and Jer. vii. 11. Luke does not, like Mark, quote the first passage to the end: "My house shall be called a house of prayer πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι, *for all peoples.*" Those last words, however, agreed perfectly with the spirit of his Gospel. He has not therefore borrowed this quotation from Mark.—The appropriateness of this quotation from Isaiah is the more striking, because it was in the court of the Gentiles that those profanations were passing. Israel was depriving the Gentiles of the place which Jehovah had posi-

[1] As we had supposed in our *Comment. sur l'évang. de Jean*, t. i. p. 376.

tively reserved for them in His house (1 Kings viii. 41–43). By the designation, *a den of thieves*, Jesus alludes to the deceptions which were connected with those different bargainings, and especially with the business of the exchangers.—If Israel in a spirit of holiness had joined with Jesus in this procedure, the act would have ceased to have a simply typical value; it would have become the real inauguration of the Messianic kingdom.

Vers. 47 and 48 are of the nature of a summary; the *καθ' ἡμέραν, daily*, and the imperfects, *they sought*, etc., prove that Luke does not affect to give a complete account of these last days. The words, *the chief of the people*, are added as an appendix to the subject of the verb *sought*. They probably denote the chiefs of the synagogue representing the people; who, with the priests and scribes, formed the Sanhedrim. This singular construction arises from the fact that the real instigators of hostilities against Jesus were the priests and scribes; the chief of the people only yielded to this pressure. This idea forms the transition from ver. 47 to ver. 48. The people formed the support of Jesus against the theocratic authorities. Certainly, if He had thought of establishing an earthly kingdom, now would have been the time. The passage Mark xi. 18 is the parallel of those two verses. But neither of the two accounts can proceed from the other.

Should this event be regarded as identical with the similar one which John places at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, ii. 13 et seq.? This seems to have been the generally received opinion in Origen's time (in Joh. T. x. 15). As the Syn. relate none but this last residence at Jerusalem, it would be very natural for them to introduce here different events which properly belonged to previous residences. See, nevertheless, in our *Comment. sur. l'évang. de Jean*, t. i. p. 391, the reasons which make it probable that the two events are different. Here we shall add two remarks: 1. Mark's narrative must rest on the detailed account of an eye-witness. Comp. those minute particulars: "And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple; *and when He had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come*, He went out unto Bethany with the Twelve" (xi. 11); "*And would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple*" (ver. 16). These are such details as are not invented; it was not tradition that had preserved them (see Luke and Matthew). They proceed, therefore, from an eye-witness. How in this case can we question Mark's narrative, and consequently that of the three Syn.? 2. If Jesus was returning for the first time

after the lapse of two years (John ii.) to the feast of Passover, which more than any other gave occasion to those scandals (Bleek on Matt. xxi. 12), He could not but be roused anew against the abuses which He had checked the first time, more especially in the Messianic attitude which He had taken up. Here, then, again John supplies what the others have omitted, and omits what they have sufficiently narrated.

2. *The Question of the Sanhedrim:* xx. 1–8.—Vers. 1–8.[1] This account is separated from the preceding, in Mark and Matthew, by the brief mention of two events: in Mark xi. 16, the prohibition of Jesus to carry vessels across the temple,—the court was probably used as a thoroughfare (Bleek); in Matt. xxi. 14 et seq., the cures wrought in the temple, and the hosannas of the children. The authority which Jesus thus assumed in this sacred place was well suited to occasion the step taken by the Sanhedrim. If we follow Mark, it must have taken place on the day after the purification of the temple and the cursing of the barren fig-tree, and consequently on the Tuesday or Wednesday morning. Luke omits those events, which were unknown to him, as well as the cursing of the barren fig-tree, which related specially to Israel.

Since the evening before, the members of the Sanhedrim had been in consultation (ζητεῖν of xix. 47); and their *seeking* had not been in vain. They had succeeded in inventing a series of questions fitted to entangle Jesus, or in the end to extract from Him an answer which would compromise Him either with the people or with the Jewish or Gentile authorities. The question of ver. 2 is the first result of those conclaves. Ver. 1 enumerates the three classes of members composing the Sanhedrim; it was therefore a formal deputation, comp. John i. 19 et seq. The *elders* are mentioned here also (comp. xix. 47) as secondary personages, beside the high priests and scribes. The first part of the question relates to the *nature* of Jesus' commission: is it divine or human?

[1] Ver. 1. ℵ. B. D. L. Q. several Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. omit εκεινων after ημερων. The Mss. are divided between αρχιερεις (T. R., Alex.) and ιερεις (Byz.).—Ver. 2. ℵ* C. omit ειπε ημιν. ℵᵃ B. L. R. 2 Mnn. read ειπον instead of ειπε.—Ver. 3. ℵ. B. L. R. 7 Mnn. omit ινα before λογον.—Ver. 4. ℵ. D. L. R. add το before Ιωαννου.—Ver. 5. ℵ. C. D. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}, Vg., συνελογιζοντο instead of συνελογισαντο.—13 Mjj. several Mnn. It^{alii}. omit ουν after διατι.—Ver. 6. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn., ο λαος απας instead of πας ο λαος.

The second, to the *intermediate agent* through whom He has received it. The Sanhedrim made sure that Jesus would claim a divine commission, and hoped to take advantage of this declaration to bring Jesus to its bar, and to sit in judgment on the question. On the one hand, Jesus avoids this snare; on the other, He avoids declining the universally recognised competency of the Sanhedrim. He replies in such a way as to force His adversaries themselves to declare their incompetence.—The question which He lays before them is not a skilful manœuvre; it is dictated by the very nature of the situation. Was it not through the instrumentality of John the Baptist that Jesus had been divinely accredited to the people? The acknowledgment, therefore, of Jesus' authority really depended on the acknowledgment of John's. The second alternative, *of men*, includes the two possible cases, of himself, or of some other human authority.—The embarrassment of His adversaries is expressed by the three Syn. in ways so different, that it is impossible to derive the three forms from one and the same written source. This question has sufficed to disconcert them. They, the wise, the skilled, who affect to judge of everything in the theocracy,—they shamefully decline a judgment in face of an event of such capital importance as was the appearing of John! There is a blending of indignation and contempt in the *neither do I* of Jesus (ver. 8). But that answer which He refuses them, they who have refused Him theirs, He goes on to give immediately after in the following parable. Only it is *to the whole people* that He will address it (πρὸς τὸν λαόν, ver. 9), as a solemn protestation against the hypocritical conduct of their chiefs.

Why did Luke omit the cursing of the barren fig-tree? He was well aware, answers Volkmar, that it was simply an *idea* represented by Mark in the form of a *fact;* and he restored to it its true character by presenting it, xiii. 6–9, in the form of a parable. So the description of God's *patience* toward Israel, the barren fig-tree (xiii. 6–9), is one and the same lesson with the *cursing* of that same fig-tree! Why does Matthew make the cursing of the fig-tree, and the conversation of Jesus with His disciples on that occasion, fall at the same period and on the same day,—two facts which are separated in Mark by a whole day? Holtzmann answers: On reading (Mark xi. 12) the first half of this account, Matthew determined to leave it out. But on coming to the second half (Mark v. 20), he took the

resolution to insert it; only he combined them in one. So, when the evangelist was composing his narrative, he read for the first time the document containing the history which he was relating! In view of such admirable discoveries, is there not reason to say: *Risum teneatis?*

3. *The Parable of the Husbandmen:* xx. 9–19. — This parable, in Matthew, is preceded by that of the two sons. If, as the terms of the latter suppose, it applies to the conduct of the chiefs toward John the Baptist, it is admirably placed before that of the husbandmen, which depicts the conduct of those same chiefs toward Jesus.

Vers. 9–12.[1] We have just attested the accuracy of the introduction, and especially that of the words *to the people*, ver. 9. Holtzmann judges otherwise: "A parable *inappropriately addressed to the people* in Luke," says he. Is it possible to pronounce a falser judgment? The vine denotes the theocratic people, and the husbandmen the authorities who govern them. Luke speaks neither of the *tower* meant to receive the workmen's tools and to guard the domain, which perhaps represents the kingly office; nor of the *wine-press*, the means of turning the domain to account, which is perhaps the image of the priesthood (comp. Matthew and Mark). The absence of the proprietor corresponds to that whole period of the O. T. which followed the great manifestations by which God founded the theocracy—the going out of Egypt, the giving of the law, and the settlement of Israel in Canaan. From that moment Israel should have offered to its God *the fruits* of a gratitude and fidelity proportioned to the favour which it had received from Him. The three servants successively sent represent the successive groups of prophets, those divine messengers whose struggles and sufferings are described (Heb. xi.) in such lively colours. There is a climax in the conduct of the husbandmen: ver. 10, the envoy is beaten; ver. 11, beaten and shamefully abused; ver. 12, wounded to death and cast out of the vineyard. In this last touch, Jesus alludes to

[1] Ver. 9. Marcion omitted vers. 9–18.—19 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit *τις* after *ανθρωπος*, which T. R. reads, with A. some Mnn. Syr.—Ver. 10. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. It$^{alliq.}$ omit *ιν* before *καιρω*.—The Mss. are divided between *δωσιν* (T. R., Byz.) and *δωσουσιν* (Alex.).—Ver. 12. A. K. Π. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., *κακεινον* instead of *και τουτον*.

the fate of Zacharias (xi. 51), and probably also to that of John the Baptist. In Mark, the climax is nearly the same: ἔδειραν (*to beat*), ἐκεφαλαίωσαν (here, *to wound in the head*), ἀπέκτειναν (*to kill*). Mark speaks also of other messengers who underwent the same treatment; it is perhaps this last description which should be applied to John the Baptist. Matthew speaks only of two sendings, but each embracing several individuals. Should we understand the two principal groups of prophets: Isaiah, with his surrounding of minor prophets, and Jeremiah with his? The Hebraistic expression προσέθετο πέμψαι (vers. 11 and 12) shows that Luke is working on an Aramaic document. No similar expression occurs in Matthew and Mark.

Vers. 13–16.[1] The master of the vineyard rouses himself in view of this obstinate and insolent rejection: *What shall I do?* And this deliberation leads him to a final measure: *I will send my beloved son.* This saying, put at that time by Jesus in the mouth of God, has a peculiar solemnity. There is His answer to the question: *By what authority doest thou these things?*—Here, as everywhere, the meaning of the title *son* transcends absolutely the notion of Messiah, or theocratic king, or any *office* whatever. The title expresses above all the notion of a personal relation to God as Father. The theocratic office flows from this relation. By this name, Jesus establishes between the servants and Himself an immeasurable distance. This was implied already by the question, *What shall I do . . .?* which suggests the divine dialogue, Gen. i. 26, whereby the creation of inferior beings is separated from that of man. Ἴσως, properly, *in a way agreeable to expectation;* and hence, *undoubtedly* (E. V. improperly, *it may be*). But does not God know beforehand the result of this last experiment? True; but this failure will not at all overturn His plan. Not only will the mission of this last messenger be successful with *some,* but the resistance of the people as a whole, by bringing on their destruction, will open up the world to the free preaching of salvation by those few. The ignorance

[1] Ver. 13.—א. B. C. D. L. Q. some Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}, omit ἰδόντες before ἐντραπήσονται.—Ver. 14. A. K. Π. 4 Mnn. It^{plerique}, διελογίσαντο instead of διελογίζοντο.—א. B. D. L. R. some Mnn., πρὸς ἀλλήλους instead of πρὸς ἑαυτούς.—6 Mjj. 12 Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit δίδωσι before ἀποκτείνωμεν.

of the future which is ascribed to the master of the vineyard belongs to the figure. The idea represented by this detail is simply the reality of human liberty.

The deliberation of the husbandmen (ver. 14) is an allusion to that of the chiefs, ver. 5 (*διελογίζοντο* or *—σαντο*; comp. with *συνελογίσαντο*). Jesus unveils before all the people the plots of their chiefs, and the real cause of the hatred with which they follow Him. These men have made the theocracy their property (John xi. 48: *our place, our nation*); and this power, which till now they have turned to their advantage, they cannot bring themselves to give up into the hands of the Son, who comes to claim it in His Father's name.—At ver. 15, Jesus describes with the most striking calmness the crime which they are preparing to commit on His person, and from which He makes not the slightest effort to escape. Is the act of *casting out of the vineyard*, which precedes the murder, intended to represent the excommunication already pronounced on Jesus and His adherents (John ix. 22)? In Mark the murder precedes; then the dead body is thrown out.—The punishment announced in ver. 16 might, according to Luke and Mark, apply only to the theocratic authorities, and not to the entire people. The *ἄλλοι*, the *other* husbandmen, would in this case designate the apostles and their successors. But the sense appears to be different according to Matthew. Here the word *to others* is thus explained, xxi. 43: "The kingdom of God shall be given to a *nation* (*ἔθνει*) bringing forth the fruits thereof." According to this, the point in question is not the substitution of the *chiefs* of the N. T. for those of the Old, but that of Gentile *peoples* for the chosen people. What would our critics say if the parts were exchanged, if Luke had expressed himself here as Matthew does, and Matthew as Luke? Matthew puts the answer of ver. 16 in the mouth of the adversaries of Jesus, which on their part could only mean, "He shall destroy them, that is evident; but what have we to do with that? Thy history is but an empty tale." Yet, as it is said in ver. 19 that it was not till later that His adversaries understood the bearing of the parable, the narrative of Luke and Mark is more natural. The connection between *ἀκούσαντες* and *εἶπον* is this: "they had no sooner heard than, deprecating the *omen*, they said . . ."

Vers. 17–19.[1] Ἐμβλέψας, *having beheld them*, indicates the serious, even menacing expression which He then assumed. The δέ is adversative: "Such a thing, you say, will never happen; *but* what meaning, then, do you give to this saying . . . ?" Whether in the context of Ps. cxviii. the *stone rejected* be the Jewish people as a whole, in comparison with the great world-powers, or (according to Bleek and others) the believing part of the people rejected by the unbelieving majority in both cases, the image of the stone despised by the builders applies indirectly to the Messiah, in whom alone Israel's mission to the world, and that of the believing part of the people to the whole, was realized. It is ever, at all stages of their history, the same law whose application is repeated.—The acc. λίθον is a case of attraction arising from the relative pron. which follows. This form is textually taken from the LXX. (Ps. cxviii. 22). The corner-stone is that which forms the junction between the two most conspicuous walls, that which is laid with peculiar solemnity.—A truth so stern as the sentence of ver. 18 required to be wrapped up in a biblical quotation. The words of Jesus recall Isa. viii. 14, 15, and Dan. ii. 44. In Isaiah, the Messiah is represented as a consecrated stone, against which many of the children of Israel shall be broken. Simeon (ii. 34) makes reference to this saying. The subject in question is the Messiah in His humiliation. A man's dashing himself against this stone laid on the earth means rejecting Him during the time of His humiliation. In the second part of the verse, where this stone is represented as falling from the top of the building, the subject is the glorified Messiah crushing all earthly oppositions by the manifestations of His wrath. In Dan. ii. 44 the word λικμᾷν is also found (λικμήσει πάσας τὰς βασιλείας), strictly: *to winnow*, and hence to scatter to the wind. It is therefore dangerous to encounter this stone, either by dashing against it while it is yet laid on the ground, as Israel is doing, or whether, when it shall be raised to the top of the building, men provoke it to fall on their own head, as the other nations shall one day do.—A new deliberation among the rulers follows this terrible shock (ver. 19). But fear of the people restrains them. There is a correspondence between the two καί before

[1] Ver. 19. C. D. 15 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg., ἐζήτουν instead of ἐζήτησαν.

ἐφοβήθησαν and before ἐζήτησαν. The two feelings, *fearing* and *seeking* (to put Him to death), struggle within their heart. The *for* at the end of the verse bears on the first proposition; and the πρὸς αὐτούς signifies, *with a view to them* (ver. 9, xix. 9). —In Matthew there occurs here the parable of the great supper. It is hardly probable that Jesus heaped up at one time so many figures of the same kind. The association of ideas which led the evangelist to insert the parable here is sufficiently obvious.

4. *The Question of the Pharisees:* xx. 20–26.—The official question of the Sanhedrim served only to prepare a triumph for Jesus. From this time forth the different parties make attempts on Him separately, and that by means of captious questions adroitly prepared.

Vers. 20–26.[1] The introduction to this narrative presents in our three Syn. (Matt. xxii. 15; Mark xii. 13) some marked shades of meaning. The simplest form is that of Luke. The priests and scribes (ver. 19) suborn certain parties, who, affecting a scruple of conscience (*"feigning themselves just men"*), interrogate Jesus as to whether it is lawful to pay tribute to Gentile authorities. The snare was this: Did Jesus answer in the affirmative? It was a means of destroying His influence with the people by stigmatizing His Messianic pretensions. Did He reply in the negative? He fell as a rebel into the hands of the Roman governor, who would make short work with Him. This is brought out in ver. 20 by the emphatic accumulation of the terms ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, military power and judicial authority. Once given over to that power, Jesus would be in good hands, and the Sanhedrim would have no more concern about the favour with which the people surrounded Him. Λόγου and αὐτοῦ ought both to be taken, notwithstanding Bleek's scruples, as immediately dependent on ἐπιλάβωνται: "to take *Him* by surprise, and to catch a *word* from Him by surprise." According to Mark and

[1] Ver. 20. C. K. Γ. 25 Mnn., λογον; D., των λογων; L., λογους instead of λογου. —א. B. C. D. L., ωστε instead of εις το.—Ver. 22. א. A. B. L. 6 Mnn., ημας instead of ημιν.—Ver. 23. א. B. L. 6 Mnn. omit τι με πειραζετε.—Ver. 24. 7 Mjj. 30 Mnn., δειξατε instead of επιδειξατε.—א. C. L. 50 Mnn. add οι δε επιδειξαν και επιν after δηναριον (taken from the parall.).—א. B. L. Syr^sch., οι δε instead of αποκριθεντες δε.—Ver. 25. א. B. L. 7 Mnn., προς αυτους instead of αυτοις.—Ver. 26. א. B. L., των ρηματος instead of αυτου ρηματος.

Matthew, the Pharisees in this case united with the Herodians. Bleeks thinks that the bond of union between the one party, fanatical zealots for national independence, and the other, devoted partisans of Herod's throne, was common antipathy to foreign domination. The presence of the Herodians was intended to encourage Jesus to answer in the negative, and so to put Himself in conflict with Pilate. But the attitude of the Herodians toward the Roman power was totally different from Bleek's view of it. The Herods had rather planted themselves in Israel as the vassals of Cæsar. The Herodians, says M. Reuss, "were the Jews who had taken the side of the family of Herod against the patriots," that is to say, against the Pharisees.[1] We have therefore here, what so often occurs in history, a coalition of two hostile parties, with the view of crushing a third, dangerous to both. In Galilee we have already seen a similar combination (Mark iii. 6; Luke xiii. 31, 32). There was a perfectly good reason for it in this case. If the answer of Jesus required to be denounced to the people, this task would fall to the Pharisees, who stood well with the multitude. If, on the contrary, it was necessary to go to Pilate, the Herodians would take this part, so disagreeable to the Pharisees.—According to Matthew (ver. 16), the heads of the pharisaic party took care to keep aloof. They attacked Him first through some of their disciples. In reality, their alliance with the Herodians compromised those well-known defenders of national independence.

The address of the emissaries is variously rendered in our three Gospels. Ὀρθῶς: without deviating from the straight line. Λέγειν and διδάσκειν, *to say* and *to teach*, differ as *pronouncing* on a question and *stating the grounds* of the decision. The Hebraistic phrase λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, which must have been a frightful barbarism to Greek ears (*to take the countenance*, for: to accept men's persons), is found only in Luke. It would therefore be himself, if he was copying Matthew or Mark, who had added it at his own hand—he who was writing for Greek readers! Ὁδὸς Θεοῦ, *the way of God*, denotes the straight theocratic line traced out by the law, without regard to accomplished facts or political necessities. They think by their praises to render it impossible for Him to recoil. There

[1] Herzog's *Encyclopedie*, t. xiii. p. 291.

was, in reality,—and this is what formed the apparently insurmountable difficulty of the question,—a contradiction between the pure theocratic standard and the actual state of things. The normal condition was the autonomy of God's people,—normal because founded on the divine law, and as such, sacred in the eyes of Jesus. The actual state of things was the subjection of the Jews to the Romans,—a providential situation, and as such, not less evidently willed by God. How was this contradiction to be got over? Judas the Galilean, rejecting the fact, had declared himself for the right; he had perished. This was the fate to which the rulers wished to drive Jesus. And if He recoiled, if He accepted the fact, was this not to deny the right, the legal standard, Moses, God Himself?

Is it lawful for us (ver. 22)? They have a scruple of conscience! Jesus at once discerns the malicious plot which is at the bottom of the question; He feels that never was a more dangerous snare laid for Him. But there is in the simplicity of the dove a skill which enables it to escape from the best laid string of the fowler. What made the difficulty of the question was the almost entire fusion of the two domains, the religious and political, in the Old Covenant. Jesus, therefore, has now to distinguish those two spheres, which the course of Israelitish history has in fact separated and even contrasted, so that He may not be drawn into applying to the one the absolute standard which belongs only to the other. Israel should depend only on God, assuredly, but that in the religious domain. In the political sphere, God may be pleased to put it for a time in a state of dependence on a human power, as had formerly happened in their times of captivity, as is the case at present in relation to Cæsar. Did not even the theocratic constitution itself distinguish between the tribute to be paid to the king and the dues to be paid to the priests and the temple? This legal distinction became only more precise and emphatic when the sceptre fell into Gentile hands. What remained to be said was not God *or* Cæsar, but rather, God *and* Cæsar, each in his own sphere. The Gentile money which passed current in Israel attested the providential fact of the establishment of the Roman dominion, and of the acceptance of that state of things by the theocratic people. *Ubicunque numisma regis alicujus obtinet, illic incolæ regem*

istum pro domino agnoscunt, says the famous Jewish doctor Maimonides (quoted by Bleek). The piece of Roman money which Jesus calls His adversaries to show, establishes by the image and inscription which it bears the existence of this foreign power in the political and lower sphere of the theocratic life; it is to this sphere that the payment of tribute belongs; the debt should therefore be discharged. But above this sphere there is that of the religious life which has God for its object. This sphere is fully reserved by the answer of Jesus; and He declares that all its obligations can be fulfilled, without in the least doing violence to the duties of the other. He accepts with submission the actual condition, while reserving fidelity to Him who can re-establish the normal condition as soon as it shall seem good to Him. Jesus Himself had never felt the least contradiction between those two orders of duties; and it is simply from His own pure consciousness that He derives this admirable solution. The word ἀπόδοτε, *render*, implies the notion of *moral duty* toward Cæsar, quite as much as toward God. De Wette is therefore certainly mistaken here in limiting the notion of *obligation* to the things which are God's, and applying merely the notion of *utility* to the things which are Cæsar's. St. Paul understood the thought of Jesus better, when he wrote to the Romans (xiii. 1 et seq.): "Be subject to the powers . . ., not only from fear of punishment, but also *for conscience' sake*." Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 1 et seq.; 1 Pet. ii. 13 et seq. Dependence on God does not exclude, but involves, not only many personal duties, but the various external and providential relations of dependence in which the Christian may find himself placed, even that of slavery (1 Cor. vii. 22).[1] As to theocratic independence, Jesus knew well that the way to regain it was not to violate the duty of submission to Cæsar by a revolutionary shaking off of his yoke, but to return to the faithful fulfilment of all duties toward God. To render to God what is God's, was the way for the people of God to obtain anew David instead of Cæsar as their Lord.—Who could find a word to condemn in this solution? To the Pharisees, the *Render unto Cæsar;* to the Herodians, the *Render unto God.* Each carries away his own lesson; Jesus

[1] [According to the interpretation, "use *servitude* rather." See Lange's comment. on the passage.—TRANS.]

alone issues triumphantly from the ordeal which was to have destroyed Him.

5. *The Question of the Sadducees:* xx. 27–40.—We know positively from Josephus that the Sadducees denied at once the resurrection of the body, the immortality of the soul, and all retribution after death (*Antiq.* xviii. 1. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14). It was not that they rejected either the O. T. in general, or any of its parts. How, in that case, could they have sat in the Sanhedrim, and filled the priesthood? Probably they did not find personal immortality taught clearly enough in the books of Moses; and as to the prophetic books, they ascribed to them only secondary authority.[1]

Vers. 27–33.[2] *The Question.*—The Sadducees, starting from the Levirate law given by Moses (Deut. xxv. 5), agreeably to a patriarchal usage (Gen. xxxviii.) which is still allowed by many Eastern peoples, seek to cover with ridicule the idea of a resurrection; *ἀντιλέγοντες*: *who oppose* (*ἀντί*), *maintaining that* (*λέγοντες*).—The whole statement vers. 29–33 has in it a touch of sarcasm.

Vers. 34–40.[3] *The Answer.*—This answer is preceded in Matthew and Mark by a severe rebuke, whereby Jesus makes His questioners aware of the gross spiritual ignorance involved in such a question as theirs.—The answer of Jesus has also a sarcastic character. Those accumulated verbs, *γαμεῖν, ἐκγαμίζεσθαι,* especially with the frequentative *γαμίσκεσθαι* or *ἐκγαμίσκεσθαι,* throw a shade of contempt over that whole worldly train, above which the Sadducean mind is incapable of rising. Although from a moral point of view the *αἰὼν μέλλων, the world to come,* has already begun with the coming of Christ, from a physical point of view, *the present world* is prolonged

[1] Read on this subject the excellent treatise of M. Reuss, Herzog's *Encyclopedie,* t. xiii. p. 289 et seq.

[2] Ver. 27. ℵ. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. Syr., *λέγοντες* instead of *ἀντιλέγοντες.*—Ver. 28. ℵ^a B. L. P. some Mnn. Syr. It$^{allq.}$ Vg., *ἡ* instead of *ἀποθάνῃ.*—Ver. 30. ℵ. B. D. L., *καὶ ὁ δεύτερος* instead of *καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ δεύτ. π. γυν. καὶ οὗτος ἀπέθ. ἄτεκνος.*—Ver. 31. 12 Mjj. omit *καί* before *οὐ.*—Ver. 32. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. Syr. omit *πάντων.*—Ver. 33. ℵ. D. G. L. some Mnn. Syr. It., *ἔσται* instead of *γίνεται.*

[3] Ver. 34. ℵ. B. D. L. 2 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. omit *ἀποκριθείς* (which is taken from the parallels).—ℵ. B. L. 8 Mnn., *γαμίσκονται* instead of *ἐκγαμίζονται.*—Ver. 36. A. B. D. L. P., *οὐδὲ* instead of *οὔτε.*—Ver. 37. Marcion omitted vers. 37 and 38.

till the resurrection of the body, which is to coincide with the restitution of all things. The resurrection *from the dead* is very evidently, in this place, not the resurrection *of the dead* in general. What is referred to is a special privilege granted only to the faithful (*which shall be accounted worthy;* comp. xiv. 14, the resurrection *of the just,* and Phil. iii. 11).

The first *for,* ver. 36, indicates a causal relation between the cessation of marriage, ver. 35, and that of death, ver. 36. The object of marriage is to preserve the human species, to which otherwise death would soon put an end; and this constitution must last till the number of the elect whom God will gather in is completed. While the *for* makes the cessation of death to be the *cause* of the cessation of marriage, the particle οὔτε, *neither,* brings out the analogy which exists between those two facts. The reading οὐδέ is less supported.—Jesus does not say (ver. 36) that glorified men are angels,—angels and men are of two different natures, the one cannot be transformed into the other,—but that they are *equal with the angels,* and that in two respects: no death, and no marriage. Jesus therefore ascribes a body to the angels, exempt from the difference of sex. This positive teaching about the existence and nature of angels is purposely addressed by Jesus to the Sadducees, because, according to Acts xxiii. 8, this party denied the existence of those beings.—Jesus calls the raised ones *children of God,* and explains the title by that of *children of the resurrection.* Men on the earth are sons of one another; each of the raised ones is directly a child of God, because his body is an immediate work of divine omnipotence. It thus resembles that of the angels, whose body also proceeds directly from the power of the Creator,—a fact which explains the name *sons of God,* by which they are designated in the O. T. The Mosaic command could not therefore form an objection to the doctrine of the resurrection rightly understood. Jesus now takes the offensive, and proves by that very Moses whom they had been opposing to Him (καί, *even,* before *Moses*), the indisputable truth of the doctrine (vers. 37 and 38). The scribes of the pharisaic party had probably often tried to discover such a proof; but it was necessary to dig deeply in the mine to extract from it this diamond.

In the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ἐπί denotes the place where

the account of the bush is found. The choice of the word *μηνύω, to give to understand,* shows that Jesus distinguishes perfectly between an express declaration which does not exist, and an *indication* such as that which He proceeds to cite. He means simply, that if Moses had not had the idea of immortality, he would not have expressed himself as he does. When Moses put into the mouth of God the designation: *God of Abraham,* etc., many generations had passed since the three patriarchs lived here below; and yet God still calls Himself *their God.* God cannot be the God of a being who does not exist. Therefore, in Him they live. Mark the absence of the article before the words *νεκρῶν* and *ζώντων*: *a God of dead, of living beings.* In Plato, it is their participation in the *idea* which guarantees existence; in the kingdom of God, it is their relation to God Himself. The dative *αὐτῷ, to Him,* implies a contrast to *to us,* to whom the dead are as though they were not. Their existence and activity are entirely concentrated in their relation to God. *All;* not only the three patriarchs. The *for* bears on the word *living.* "For they live, really dead though they are to us."

This prompt and sublime answer filled with admiration the scribes who had so often sought this decisive word in Moses without finding it; they cannot restrain themselves from testifying their joyful surprise. Aware from this time forth that every snare laid for Him will be the occasion for a glorious manifestation of His wisdom, they give up this sort of attack (ver. 40).

6. *The Question of Jesus:* xx. 41–44.—Vers. 41–44.[1] Matthew and Mark place here the question of a scribe on the great commandment of the law. This question was suggested to the man, as we see from Mark xii. 28, by the admiration which filled him at the answers which he had just heard. According to Matthew, he wished yet again to put the wisdom of Jesus to the proof (*πειράζων αὐτόν,* Matt. xxii. 35). Either Luke did not know this narrative, or he omitted it because he had related one entirely similar, x. 25 et seq.

At the close of this spiritual tournament, Jesus in His turn throws down a challenge to His adversaries. Was it to give

[1] Ver. 41. A. K. M. Π. 20 Mnn. add *τινες* after *λεγουσι*.—Ver. 42. ℵ. B. L. R. some Mnn., *αυτος γαρ* instead of *και αυτος*.

them difficulty for difficulty, entanglement for entanglement? No; the similar question which He had put to them, ver. 4, has proved to us that Jesus was acting in a wholly different spirit. What, then, was His intention? He had just announced His death, and pointed out the authors of it (parable of the husbandmen). Now, He was not ignorant what the charge would be which they would use against Him. He would be condemned as a blasphemer, and that for having called Himself the *Son of God* (John v. 18, x. 33; Matt. xxvi. 65). And as He was not ignorant that before such a tribunal it would be impossible for Him to plead His cause in peace, He demonstrates beforehand, in presence of the whole people, and by the Old Testament, the divinity of the Messiah, thus sweeping away from the Old Testament standpoint itself the accusation of blasphemy which was to form the pretext for His condemnation. The three Syn. have preserved, with slight differences, this remarkable saying, which, with Luke x. 21, 22 and some other passages, forms the bond of union between the teaching of Jesus in those Gospels, and all that is affirmed of His person in that of John. If it is true that Jesus applied to Himself the title of David's *Lord*, with which this king addressed the Messiah in Ps. cx., the consciousness of His divinity is implied in this title as certainly as in any declaration whatever of the fourth Gospel.

According to Luke, it is to the scribes, according to Matthew (xxii. 41), to the Pharisees, that the following question is addressed. Mark names no one. The three narratives differ likewise slightly in the form of the question: "How say they?" (Luke); "How say the scribes?" (Mark.) In Matthew, Jesus declares to the Pharisees at the same time the doctrine of the Davidic sonship of the Messiah,—very natural diversities if they arise from a tradition which had taken various forms, but inexplicable if they are intentional, as they must be, supposing the use of one and the same written source. The Alex. read: "*For* he himself . . .;" that is to say: "there is room to put this question; for . . ." The Byz.: "*And* (nevertheless) he himself hath said . . ." Luke says: *in the book of Psalms*; Matthew: *by the Spirit*; Mark: *by the Holy Spirit*.—The non-Messianic explanations of Ps. cx. are the masterpiece of rationalistic arbitrariness. They begin by giving to לדוד the

meaning: "addressed *to* David," instead of: "composed *by* David," contrary to the uniform sense of the ל *auctoris* in the titles of the Psalms, and that to make David the *subject* of the Psalm, which would be impossible if he were its author (Ewald). And as this interpretation turns out to be untenable, for David never was a priest (ver. 4: "Thou art a *priest* for ever"), they transfer the composition of the Psalm to the age of the Maccabees, and suppose it addressed by some author or other to Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabeus, of the priestly race. This person, who never even bore the title of king, is the man whom an unknown flatterer is supposed, according to Hitzig, to celebrate as seated at Jehovah's right hand! It is impossible to cast a glance at the contents of the Psalm without recognising its *directly* Messianic bearing: 1. A Lord of David; 2. Raised to Jehovah's throne, that is to say, to participation in omnipotence; 3. Setting out from Zion on the conquest of the world, overthrowing the kings of the earth (ver. 4), judging *the nations* (ver. 5), and that by means of an army of priests clothed in their sacerdotal garments (ver. 3); 4. Himself at once *a priest and a king*, like Melchisedec before Him. The law, by placing the kingly power in the tribe of Judah, and the priesthood in that of Levi, had raised an insurmountable barrier between those two offices. This separation David must often have felt with pain. Uzziah attempted to do away with it; but he was immediately visited with punishment. It was reserved for the Messiah alone, at the close of the theocracy, to reproduce the sublime type of the King-Priest, presented at the date of its origin in the person of Melchisedec. Comp. on the future reunion of those two offices in the Messiah, the wonderful prophecy of Zech. vi. 9–15. Ps. cx., besides its evidently prophetic bearing, possesses otherwise all the characteristics of David's compositions: a conciseness which is forcible and obscure; brilliancy and freshness in the images; grandeur and richness of intuition. It was from the words: *Sit Thou at my right hand*, that Jesus took His answer to the adjuration of the high priest in the judgment-scene (Matt. xxvi. 64): "Henceforth shall ye see the Son of man *sitting on the right hand* of power." With what a look of severity, turned upon His adversaries at the very moment when He quoted this Psalm before all the

people, must He have accompanied this declaration of Jehovah to the Messiah: "*until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.*"

To answer satisfactorily the question of ver. 44, put by Jesus, it was absolutely necessary to introduce the idea of the divinity of the Messiah, which is the soul of the entire Old Testament. Isaiah called the Son born to us: *Wonderful, mighty God* (Isa. ix. 5). Micah had distinguished His historic birth at Bethlehem, and His pre-historic birth *from everlasting* (v. 2). Malachi had called the Messiah, "*Adonai* coming to *His temple*" (iii. 1). There was in the whole of the Old Testament, from the patriarchal theophanies down to the latest prophetic visions, a constant current toward the incarnation as the goal of all those revelations. The appearance of the Messiah presents itself more and more clearly to the view of the prophets as the perfect theophany, the final coming of Jehovah. No doubt, since the exile, exclusive zeal for monotheism had diverted Jewish theology from this normal direction. This is the fact which Jesus sets before its representatives in that so profound argument of His, John x. 34–38. It was exactly in this way that Rabbinical monotheism had become petrified and transformed into a dead theism. Jesus has taken up the broken thread of the living theology of the prophets. Such is the explanation of His present question. To resolve it, the scribes would have required to plunge again into the fresh current of the ancient theocratic aspirations: The descendant promised to David (2 Sam. vii. 16) will be nothing less than Adonai coming to His temple (Mal. iii. 1); to His human birth at Bethlehem there corresponds His eternal origin in God (Mic. v. 2): such only is the reconciliation of the two titles *son* and *Lord* of David given to the person of the Messiah.

The meaning and appropriateness of Jesus' question appear to us equally manifest. It has been sought, however, to explain it otherwise.

1. Some think that Jesus argues, from the fact that Messiah is to be David's *Lord*, to prove that He cannot be *his descendant*. For it is incongruous, say they, that an ancestor should call his descendant his Lord. According to this meaning, it must be admitted that Jesus Himself knew very well that He did not descend from David, although among the people they ignorantly gave Him the title *son of David*, because they took Him for the Messiah. The Christians,

it is said, yielded at a later period to the popular Jewish instinct; and to satisfy it *invented* the two genealogies which seem to establish the Davidic descent of Jesus (Schenkel). But, (*a*) In this case, Jesus would have acted, as Keim observes, in a manner extremely imprudent, by Himself raising a question which more than any other might have prejudiced His standing with the people. "The character *son of David* could not be wanting to Him who thus publicly made it a subject of discussion" (Keim). (*b*) It would not only be the forgers, the authors of the two genealogical documents preserved by Matthew and Luke, who had admitted and propagated this late error; it would also mean the author of the Apocalypse (xxii. 16: "I am the root and *offspring* of David"). St. Paul himself would be guilty,—he who should least of all have been inclined to make such a concession to the Judaizing party (Rom. i. 3: "*of the seed of David according to the flesh*;" 2 Tim. ii. 8: "*of the seed of David*"). The whole Church must thus have connived at this falsehood, or given in to this error, and that despite of the express protestation of Jesus Himself in our passage, and without any attempt on the part of our Lord's adversaries to show up the error or falsehood of this assertion! (*c*) The argument thus understood would prove far too much; the rationalists themselves should beware of ascribing to Jesus so gross a want of logic as it would imply. If it was dishonouring to David to call any one whatsoever of his descendants his Lord, why would it be less so for him to give this title to that descendant of Abraham who should be the Messiah? Was not the family of David the noblest, the most illustrious of Israelitish families? The reasoning of Jesus would logically end in proving that the Messiah could not be an Israelite, or even a man! (*d*) Jesus would thus have put Himself in contradiction to the whole Old Testament, which represented the Christ as being born of the family of David (2 Sam. vii.; Ps. cxxxii. 17; Isa. ix. 5, 6). (*e*) Luke would also be in contradiction with himself, for he expressly makes Jesus descend from David (i. 32, 69). (*f*) How, finally, could Jesus have contented Himself with protesting so indirectly against this attribute son of David ascribed to Him by the multitude, if He had known that He did not possess it?

2. According to M. Colani also, Jesus means that the Messiah is not the *son of David*, but in this purely moral sense, that He is not the heir of his temporal power; that His kingdom is of a higher nature than David's earthly kingdom. But, (*a*) It is wholly opposed to the simple and rational meaning of the term *son of David*, not to refer it to sonship properly so called, but to make it signify, a temporal king *like David*. (*b*) It would be necessary to admit that the evangelist did not himself understand the meaning of this saying, or that he contradicts himself,—he who puts into the mouth of the angel the declaration, i. 32: "The Lord shall give unto Him the *throne* of *His father* David" (comp. ver. 69).

3. Keim admits the natural meaning of the term *Son*. He places the notion of spiritual kingship not in this term, but in that of *David's Lord*. "The physical descent of Jesus from David is of no moment;

His kingdom is not a repetition of David's. From the bosom of the heavenly glory to which He is raised, He bestows spiritual blessings on men. None, therefore, should take offence at His present poverty." But, (*a*) If that is the whole problem, the problem vanishes; for there is not the least difficulty in admitting that a descendant may be raised to a height surpassing that of his ancestor. There is no serious difficulty, if the term Lord does not include the notion of a *sonship* superior to that which is implied in the title *son of David*. (*b*) So thoroughly is this our Lord's view, that in Mark the question put by Him stands thus: "David calls Him his Lord; *how, then, is He his son?*" In Keim's sense, Jesus should have said: "David calls Him his son; *how, then, is He his Lord?*" In the form of Matthew (the Gospel to which Keim uniformly gives the preference, and to which alone he ascribes any real value), the true point of the question is still more clearly put: "*Whose son is He?*" The problem is evidently, therefore, the *Davidic sonship* of Jesus, as an undeniable fact, and yet apparently contradictory to another sonship implied in the term David's Lord. Finally, (*c*) If it was merely the spiritual nature of His kingdom which Jesus meant to teach, as Colani and Keim allege in their two different interpretations, there were many simpler and clearer ways of doing so, than the ambiguous and complicated method which on their supposition He must have employed here. The question put by Jesus would be nothing but a play of wit, unworthy of Himself and of the solemnity of the occasion.

4. According to Volkmar, this whole piece is a pure invention of Mark, the primitive evangelist, who, by putting this question in the mouth of Jesus, skilfully answered this Rabbinical objection: Jesus did not present Himself to the world either as David's descendant or as His glorious successor; consequently He cannot be the Messiah, for the O. T. makes Messiah the son of David. Mark answered by the mouth of Jesus: No; it is impossible that the O. T. could have meant to make Messiah the son of David, for according to Ps. cx. the Messiah was to be his Lord. But, (*a*) It would follow therefrom, as Volkmar acknowledges, that in the time of Jesus none had regarded Him as the descendant of David. Now the acclamations of the multitude on the day of Palms, the address of the woman of Canaan, that of Bartimeus, and all the other like passages, prove, on the contrary, that the Davidic sonship of Jesus was a generally admitted fact. (*b*) How was it that the scribes never protested against the Messianic pretensions of Jesus, especially on the occasion of His trial before the Sanhedrim, if His attribute son of David had not been a notorious fact? (*c*) The Davidic descent of the family of Jesus was so well known, that the emperor Domitian summoned the nephews of Jesus, the sons of Jude His brother, to Rome, under the designation of sons of David. (*d*) St. Paul, in the year 59, positively teaches the Davidic descent of Jesus (Rom. i. 3). And Mark, the *Pauline* (according to Volkmar), denied to Jesus this same sonship in 73 (the date, according to Volkmar, of Mark's composition), by a reasoning *ad hoc!* Still more, Luke himself, that

Pauline of the purest water, reproduces Mark's express denial, without troubling himself about the positive teaching of Paul! Volkmar attempts to elude the force of this argument by maintaining that Paul's saying in the Epistle to the Romans is only a *concession* made by him to the Judeo-Christian party! To the objection taken from the genealogy of Jesus (Luke iii. 23 et seq.), Volkmar audaciously replies that Luke mentions it only to set it aside ("*um sie zu illudiren*"). And yet this same Luke, as we have seen, expressly asserts this sonship (i. 32 and 69). (*e*) Let us add a last discovery of Volkmar's: Matthew found it useful, in the interest of the Judeo-Christian party, to accept in spite of Mark the idea of the Davidic descent of Jesus as he found it contained in Luke (in that genealogical document which Luke had quoted only to set aside)! Only, to glorify Jesus the more, he substituted *at his own hand*, for the obscure branch of Nathan (Luke's genealogy), the royal and much more glorious line of Solomon (Matthew's).

Thus our sacred writers manipulate history to suit their interest or caprice! Instead of the artless simplicity which moves us in their writings, we find in them device opposed to device, and falsehood to falsehood! Be it ours to stand aloof from such saturnalia of criticism!

Our interpretation, the only natural one in the context, is confirmed: (1) By those expressions in the Apocalypse: the *root* and *offspring* of David,—expressions which correspond to those of *Lord* and *son* of this king; (2) by Paul's twofold declaration, "*made of the seed of David* according to the flesh [David's son], and declared to be the Son of God with power since His resurrection, according to the spirit of holiness [David's Lord];" (3) by the silence of Jesus at the time of His condemnation. This question, put in the presence of all the people to the conscience of His judges, had answered beforehand the accusation of blasphemy raised against Him. Such was the practical end which Jesus had in view, when with this question He closed this decisive passage of arms.

7. *The Warning against the Scribes:* xx. 45–47.—Vers. 45–47.[1] On the field of battle where the scribes have just been beaten, Jesus judges them. This short discourse, like its parallel Mark xii. 38–40, is the summary of the great discourse Matt. xxiii., wherein Jesus pronounced His woe on the scribes and Pharisees, and which may be called the judgment of the theocratic authorities. It is the prelude to the great eschatological discourse which follows (the judgment of Jerusalem, of the Church, and of the world, Matt. xxiv. and xxv.).—In the discourse Matt. xxiii., two different discourses are combined, of which the one is transmitted to us by Luke

[1] Ver. 45. B. D. omit αὐτου after μαθηταις.—Ver. 47. D. P. R. some Mnn. Syr. It^{Plerique}, Vg., προσευχομενοι instead of προσευχονται.

(xi. 37 et seq.); in a context which leaves nothing to be desired, and the other was really uttered at the time where we find it placed in the first Gospel. We have only an abridgment in Mark and Luke, either because it was found in this form in the documents from which they drew, or, because, writing for Gentile readers, they deemed it unnecessary to transmit it to them in whole. — *Θελόντων*: who take their pleasure in.— There are two ways of explaining the spoliations referred to in the words: *devouring widows' houses.* Either they extorted considerable presents from pious women, under pretext of interceding for them,—this sense would best agree with the sequel, especially with the reading *προσευχόμενοι*;—or what is more natural and piquant, by the ambiguity of the word *eat up,* Jesus alludes to the sumptuous feasts provided for them by those women, while they filled the office of directors of the conscience; in both senses: the Tartuffes of the period. The word *πρόφασις*, strictly *pretext,* signifies secondarily, *show.* The words: *greater damnation,* include in an abridged form all the *οὐαί, woes!* of Matthew.

8. *The Widow's Alms:* xxi. 1–4.—Vers. 1–4.[1] This piece is wanting in Matthew. Why would he have rejected it, if, according to Holtzmann's view, he had before him the document from which the other two have taken it? According to Mark (xii. 41–44), Jesus, probably worn out with the preceding scene, sat down. In the court of the women there were placed, according to the Talmud (tr. *Schekalim,* vi. 1, 5, 13), thirteen coffers with horn-shaped orifices; whence their name שופרות. They were called *γαζοφυλάκια, treasuries.* This name in the sing. designated the locality as a whole where those coffers stood (John viii. 20; Josephus, *Antiq.* xix. 6. 1). This is perhaps the meaning in which the word is used in Mark (v. 41): *over against the treasury;* in Luke it is applied to the coffers themselves. — *Λεπτόν, mite:* the smallest coin, probably the eighth part of the as, which was worth from six to eight centimes (from a halfpenny to three-farthings). Two *λεπτά*, therefore, correspond nearly to two centime pieces. Bengel finely remarks on the *two:* "*one of which she might have retained.*" Mark translates this expression into Roman

[1] Ver. 2. 9 Mjj. several Mnn., *τινα καὶ* instead of *καὶ τινα*. 9 Mjj. several Mnn. omit *καὶ*.—Ver. 4. ℵ. B. L. X. 4 Mnn. Syr^{cur}. omit *τοῦ θεοῦ* after *δῶρα*.

money: "*which make a farthing*,"—a slight detail unknown to Luke, and fitted to throw light on the question where the second Gospel was composed.—In the sayings which Jesus addresses to His disciples, His object is to lead their minds to the true appreciation of human actions according to their quality, in opposition to the quantitative appreciation which forms the essence of pharisaism. Such is the meaning of the word: *she hath cast in more*; in reality, with those two mites, she had cast in her heart. The proof (γάρ, ver. 4) is given in what follows: *she hath cast in of her penury all that she had.* Ὑστέρημα, *deficiency*, denotes what the woman had as insufficient for her maintenance. "And of that too little, of that possession which in itself is already a deficiency, she has kept nothing." The word ὑστέρησις in Mark denotes not what the woman *had* as insufficient (ὑστέρημα), but her entire condition, as a state of continued penury. What a contrast to the avarice for which the scribes and Pharisees are upbraided in the preceding piece! This incident, witnessed by Jesus at such a time, resembles a flower which He comes upon all at once in the desert of official devotion, the sight and perfume of which make Him leap with joy. Such an example is the justification of the beatitudes, Luke vi., as the preceding discourse justifies the οὐαί, *woes*, in the same passage.

THIRD CYCLE.—CHAP. XXI. 5–38.

The Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem.

This piece contains a question put by the disciples (vers. 5–7), the discourse of Jesus in answer to their question (vers. 8–36), and a general view of the last days (vers. 37, 38).

1. *The Question*: vers. 5–7.[1]—To the preceding declaration, some of the hearers might have objected, that if only such gifts as the widow's had been made in that holy place, those magnificent structures and those rich offerings would not have existed. It was doubtless some such reflection which gave rise to the following conversation. This conversation took place, according to Matthew xxiv. 1 and Mark xiii. 1, as Jesus

[1] Ver. 5. ℵ. A. D. X., αναθημασιν instead of αναθημασιν.—Ver. 6. D. L. It^{plerique}, omit α after ταυτα.—ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. add ωδε after λιθω or λιθον.

left the temple, and on occasion of an observation made by *His disciples* (Matthew), or by *one of them* (Mark). According to Matthew, this observation was certainly connected with the last words of the previous discourse (not related by Mark and Luke), xxiii. 38: "*Your house is left unto you* [*desolate*]." How can it be asserted that three evangelists, copying the same document, or copying from one another, could differ in such a way?

In the answer of Jesus (ver. 6), the words, ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε, *these things which ye behold*, may be taken interrogatively: "These are the things, are they, which ye are beholding?" Or we may take them as in apposition to λίθος, and the subject of ἀφεθήσεται, which is more categorical and solemn: "As to these things which ye behold . . . there shall not be left one stone upon another."—It was evening (Luke v. 37), at the moment perhaps when the setting sun was casting his last rays on the sacred edifice and the holy city.—Several critics think that Luke places this discourse also in the temple. But this opinion does not agree either with vers. 5 and 6, where the temple buildings are contemplated by the interlocutors, which supposes them to be at some distance from which they can view them as a whole, or with ver. 7, which conveys the notion of a private conversation between the disciples and the Master. According to Mark (xiii. 3), Jesus was seated with Peter, James, John, and Andrew, on the Mount of Olives, over against that wonderful scene. Here is one of those details in which we recognise the recital of an eye-witness, probably Peter. Matthew, while indicating the situation in a way similar to Mark, does not, any more than Luke, name the four disciples present. Luke and Matthew would certainly not have omitted such a circumstance, if they had copied Mark; as, on the contrary, Mark would not have added it at his own hand, if he had compiled from the text of the other two.

The form of the disciples' question, ver. 7, differs in Luke and Mark, but the sense is the same: the question in both refers simply to the time of the destruction *of the temple*, and to the *sign* by which it shall be announced. It is, no doubt, possible the disciples more or less confounded this catastrophe with the event of the Parousia; but the text does not say so. It is quite otherwise in Matthew; according to him, the question bears expressly on those two points combined: the

time of the destruction *of the temple*, and the sign of the *coming* of Christ. Luke and Matthew each give the following discourse in a manner which is in keeping with their mode of expressing the question which gives rise to it. In Luke, this discourse contemplates exclusively *the destruction of Jerusalem*. If mention is made of the end of the world (vers. 25–27), it is only in passing, and as the result of an association of ideas which will be easily explained. The *Parousia* in itself had been previously treated of by Luke in a special discourse called forth by a question of the Pharisees (chap. xvii.). On his side, Matthew combines in the following discourse the two subjects indicated in the question, as he has expressed it; and he unites them in so intimate a way, that all attempts to separate them in the text, from Chrysostom to Ebrard and Meyer, have broken down. Comp. vers. 14 and 22, which can refer to nothing but the Parousia, while the succeeding and preceding context refer to the destruction of Jerusalem; and on the other hand, ver. 34, which points to this latter event, while all that precedes and follows this verse applies to the Parousia. The construction attempted by Gess is this: 1. From vers. 4–14, the general signs preceding the Parousia, that believers may not be led to expect this event too soon; 2. From vers. 15–28, the destruction of the temple as a sign to be joined to those precursive signs; 3. Vers. 29–31, the Parousia itself. But (*a*) this general order is far from natural. What has the destruction of the temple to do after the passage vers. 4–14, which (Gess acknowledges) supposes it consummated long ago? The piece (No. 2) on the destruction of Jerusalem is evidently out of place between the description of the signs of the Parousia (No. 1) and that of the Parousia itself (No. 3). (*b*) This division cannot be carried out into detail: ver. 22, which Gess is obliged to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, can apply only to the Parousia. And the "*all these things*" of ver. 34, which he restricts to the destruction of Jerusalem and the first preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, as first signs of the Parousia, has evidently a much wider scope in the evangelist's view. It must therefore be admitted, either that Jesus Himself confounded the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, and that those two events formed, in His judgment, one and the same

catastrophe, or that two distinct discourses uttered by Him on two different occasions appear in Matthew united in one. Different expedients have been used to save the accuracy of Matthew's account, without prejudice to the Saviour's infallibility. It has been supposed that the description of the Parousia, Matt. xxiv., refers exclusively to the *invisible* return of Jesus to destroy Jerusalem. This explanation is incompatible with the text, especially vers. 29–31. It has also been alleged that in the prophetic perspective the final coming of the Messiah appeared to the view of Jesus as in immediate connection with His return to judge Israel. But (*a*) this hypothesis does not at all attain the end which its authors propose, that of saving our Lord's infallibility. (*b*) Jesus could not affirm here what He elsewhere declares that He does not know (Mark xiii. 32), the time of the Parousia. Even after His resurrection He still refuses to give an answer on this point, which is reserved by *the Father* in His own power (Acts i. 6, 7). (*c*) We can go further, and show that Jesus had a quite opposite view to that of the nearness of His return. While He announces the destruction of Jerusalem as an event to be witnessed by the contemporary generation, He speaks of the Parousia as one which is possibly yet very remote. Consider the expression, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, *days will come* (Luke xvii. 22), and the parable of the widow, the meaning of which is, that God will seem to the Church an unjust judge, who *for a protracted time* refuses to hear her, so that during this time of waiting the faith of many shall give way (xviii. 1 et seq.). The Master is to return; but perhaps it will not be till the *second*, or the *third watch*, or even *till the morning*, that He will come (Mark xiii. 35; Luke xii. 38). The great distance at which the capital lies (Luke xix. 12) can signify nothing else than the considerable space of time which will elapse between the departure of Jesus and His return. In Matt. xxv. 5 the bridegroom tarries much longer than the bridal procession expected; xxiv. 48, the unfaithful servant strengthens himself in his evil-doing by the reflection that his Lord delayeth His coming. Matt. xxiv. 14, the gospel is to be preached in all the world and to all the Gentiles (Mark xvi. 15, *to every creature*); and Matt. xxvi. 13, Mary's act is to be published in the whole

world before Jesus shall return. In fine, the gospel shall transform humanity, not by a magical process, but by slow and profound working, like that of *leaven* in dough. The kingdom of God will grow on the earth like a tree which proceeds from an imperceptible seed, and which serves in its maturity to shelter *the birds of heaven*. And Jesus, who knew human nature so deeply, could have imagined that such a work could have been accomplished in less than forty years! Who can admit it? The confusion which prevails in this whole discourse, Matt. xxiv. (as well as in Mark xiii.), and which distinguishes it from the two distinct discourses of Luke, must therefore be ascribed not to Jesus, but to the account which Matthew used as the basis of his recital.

This confusion in Matthew is probably closely connected with the Judeo-Christian point of view, under the sway of which primitive tradition took its form. In the prophets, the drama of the *last days*, which closes the eschatological perspective, embraces as two events nearly following one another, the judgment whereby Israel is purified by means of the Gentiles, and the punishment of the Gentiles by Jehovah. Preoccupied with this view, the hearers of Jesus easily overlooked in His discourses certain transitions which reserved the interval between those two events usually combined in the O. T.; and that so much the more, as, on looking at it closely, the destruction of Jerusalem is really the *first act* of the world's judgment and of the end of the days. The harvest of an early tree announces and inaugurates the general harvest; so the judgment of Jerusalem is the prelude and even the first act of the judgment of humanity. The Jew has priority in judgment, because he had priority of grace (comp. the two corresponding *πρῶτον*, Rom. ii. 9, 10). With the judgment on Jerusalem, the hour of the world's judgment has really struck. The present epoch is due to a suspension of the judgment already begun,—a suspension the aim of which is to make way for the time of grace which is to be granted to the Gentiles (*καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, the times of the Gentiles*). The close combination of the destruction of Jerusalem with the end of the world in Matthew, though containing an error in a chronological point of view, rests on a moral idea which is profoundly true.

Thus everything authorizes us to give the preference to

Luke's account. 1. Matthew's constant habit of grouping together in one, materials belonging to different discourses; 2. The precise historical situation which gave rise to the special discourse of chap. xvii. on the coming of Christ, and which cannot be an invention of Luke; 3. The established fact, that the confusion which marks the discourse of Matthew was foreign to the mind of Jesus; 4. Finally, we have a positive witness to the accuracy of Luke; that is Mark. For though his great eschatological discourse (chap. xiii.) presents the same confusion as that of Matthew in the question of the disciples which calls it forth, it is completely at one with Luke, and, like him, mentions only one subject, the destruction of Jerusalem.

Might Mark have taken the form of his question from Luke, and that of the discourse from Matthew, as Bleek alleges? But the incongruity to which such a course would have led would be unworthy of a serious writer. Besides, the form of the question is not the same in Mark as in Luke. Finally, the original details which we have pointed out in Mark, as well as those special and precise details with which his narrative abounds, from the day of the entry into Jerusalem onwards, do not admit of this supposition. No more can Luke have taken his question from Mark. He would have borrowed at the same time the details peculiar to Mark which he wants, and the form of the question is too well adapted in his Gospel to the contents of the discourse to admit of this supposition. It must therefore be concluded, that if in the compilation of the discourse Mark came under the influence of the tradition to which Matthew's form is due, the form of the question in his Gospel nevertheless remains as a very striking trace of the accuracy of Luke's account. The form of the question in Matthew must have been modified to suit the contents of the discourse; and thus it is that it has lost its original unity and precision, which are preserved in the other two evangelists.

2. *The Discourse:* vers. 8–36.—The four points treated by Jesus are: 1*st.* The apparent signs, which must not be mistaken for true signs (vers. 8–19); 2*d.* The true sign, and the destruction of Jerusalem which will immediately follow it, with the time of the Gentiles which will be connected with it (vers. 20–24); 3*d.* The Parousia, which will bring this period to an end (vers. 25–27); 4*th.* The practical application (vers. 28–36).

Vers. 8–19.[1] *The Signs which are not such.*—"*But He said, Take heed that ye be not deceived; for many shall come in my name, saying, I am he, and the time draweth near. Go ye not therefore after them.* 9. *And when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified; for these things must first come to pass; but the end cometh not so speedily.* 10. *Then said He unto them, Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom.* 11. *And great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines, and pestilences, as well as great and terrible signs from heaven.* 12. *But above all, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, bringing you before kings and rulers for my name's sake.* 13. *But it shall turn to you for a testimony.* 14. *Settle it, therefore, in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer.* 15. *For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist.* 16. *And ye shall be betrayed even by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death;* 17. *And ye shall be hated of all for my name's sake;* 18. *And there shall not an hair of your head perish.* 19. *In your patience save ye your lives.*"—The sign to which the question of the apostle refers is not indicated till ver. 20. The signs vers. 8–19 are enumerated solely to put believers on their guard against the decisive value which they might be led to ascribe to them. The vulgar are inclined to look on certain extraordinary events in nature or society as the evidences of some approaching catastrophe. Many events of this kind will happen, Jesus means to say, but without your being warranted yet to conclude that the great event is near, and so to take measures precipitately. The *seduction* of which Matthew and Mark speak is that which shall be practised by the false Messiahs. The meaning is probably the same in Luke (γάρ). History, it is true, does not attest the presence of false Messiahs before the destruction of Jerusalem. And those who are most embarrassed by this fact are just our

[1] Ver. 8. ℵ. B. D. L. X. 2 Mnn. Vss. omit ουν.—Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. place και before κατα τοπους.—Ver. 12. ℵ. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., απαγομενους instead of αγομενους.—Ver. 14. The Mss. are divided between θεσθε and θετε, between εις τας καρδιας (T. R.) and εν ταις καρδιαις (Alex.).—Ver. 15. ℵ. B. L. 5 Mnn., αντιστηναι η αντειπειν instead of αντειπειν ουδε αντιστηναι.—Ver. 18. Marcion omitted this verse.—Ver. 19. A. B. some Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., κτησεσθε instead of κτησασθε.

modern critics, who see in this discourse nothing but a prophecy *ab eventu*. They suppose that the author alludes to such men as Judas the Galilean, the Egyptian (Acts xxi.), Theudas, and others, prudently described by Josephus as mere heads of parties, but who really put forth Messianic pretensions. This assertion is hard to prove. For our part, who see in this discourse a real prophecy, we think that Jesus meant to put believers on their guard against false teachers, such as Simon the magician, of whom there may have been a great number at this period, though he is the only one of whom profane history speaks.—The *μὴ πτοηθῆναι, not to let themselves be terrified* (ver. 9), refers to the temptation to a premature emigration. Comp. the opposite ver. 21. Further, it must not be concluded from the political convulsions which shall shake the East that the destruction of Jerusalem is now near.

Jesus had uttered in substance His whole thought in those few words; and He might have passed immediately to the contrast *ὅταν δέ, but when* (ver. 20). Yet He developes the same idea more at length, vers. 10–19. Hence the words in which Luke expressly resumes his report: *Then said He unto them* (ver. 10). This passage, vers. 10–19, might therefore have been inserted here by Luke as a fragment borrowed from a separate document differing from the source whence he took the rest of the discourse.—We should not take the words ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς as a parenthetical proposition, and connect τότε with ἐγερθήσεται: "Then said He unto them, One nation shall rise." According to the analogy of Luke's style, we should rather translate: "*Then said He unto them, One nation . . .*" When to great political commotions there are added certain physical phenomena, the imagination is carried away, and the people become prophets. Jesus puts the Church of Palestine on its guard against this tendency (ver. 11). It is well known that the times which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem were signalized in the East by many calamities, particularly by a dreadful famine which took place under Claudius, and by the earthquake which destroyed Laodicea, Hierapolis, etc., in 67 or 68.[1] By the *signs from heaven* we

[1] "The *Annals* of Tacitus and the *Antiquities* of Josephus prove famines, earthquakes, etc., in the times of Claudius and Nero and of the Jewish war" (Strauss, *Leben Jesu für d. d. Volk*, p. 238).

are to understand meteors, auroras, eclipses, etc., phenomena to which the vulgar readily attach a prophetic significance.

One of those events which contribute most to inflame fanaticism in a religious community is persecution; thus are connected vers. 12 and 13. Those which are announced will arise either from the Jews (*synagogues*), like that marked by the martyrdoms of Stephen and James, or from the Gentiles (*kings and rulers*), like that to which Paul was exposed in Palestine, or that raised by Nero at Rome.—In the phrase, *before all these*, the πρό (*before*) refers to the importance of this sign, not to its time. Meyer denies that πρό can have this meaning; but Passow's dictionary cites a host of examples for it. It is, besides, the only meaning which suits the context. If πρό here signified *before*, why not speak of the persecutions before the preceding signs? What Jesus means by this word is, that among all those signs, this is the one which might most easily throw His disciples out of the calm attitude in which they ought to persevere. We have translated the passive ἀγομένους by the active (*bringing*). It is hardly possible to render the passive form into English. Holtzmann thinks that Luke here traces *after the event*, though in the form of prophecy, the picture of those persecutions to which St. Paul was exposed. Can we suppose an evangelist, to whom Jesus is the object of faith, allowing himself deliberately thus to put words into His mouth after his fancy?—Bleek applies the word *testimony* (ver. 13) to that which will accrue *to* the apostles from this proof of their fidelity. It is more natural, having in view the connection with vers. 14 and 15 (*therefore*, ver. 14), to understand by it what they shall themselves render on occasion of their persecution. This idea falls back again into the *Be not terrified:* "All that will only end in giving you the opportunity of glorifying me!" It is the same with vers. 14 and 15, the object of which is to inspire them with the most entire tranquillity of soul in the carrying out of their mission. Jesus charges Himself with everything: ἐγὼ δώσω, *I* will give.—The *mouth* is here the emblem of the perfect ease with which they shall become the organs of the *wisdom* of Jesus, without the least preparation. The term ἀντειπεῖν, *gainsay*, refers to the fact that their adversaries shall find it impossible to make any valid reply to the defence of

the disciples; the word *resist*, to the powerlessness to answer when the disciples, assuming the offensive, shall attack them with the sword of the gospel. In the Alex. reading, which places ἀντιστῆναι first, we must explain ἢ in the sense of *or even*.

To official persecution there shall be added the sufferings of domestic enmity. The name of Jesus will open up a gulf between them and their nearest. Ver. 17 is almost identical with John xv.–21. But even in that case there will be no ground for disquiet. The time will not yet have come for them to quit the accursed city and land. Ver. 18: "*There shall not an hair of your head perish*," seems to contradict the close of ver. 16: "*some of you shall perish*." This contradiction is explained by the general point of view from which we explain this piece: There shall, indeed, be some individual believers who shall perish in the persecution, but the Christian community of Palestine as a whole shall escape the extermination which will overtake the Jewish people. Their condition is indicated in ver. 19, where this piece is resumed. It is one of patience, that is to say, peaceful waiting for the divine signal, without being drawn aside either by the appeals of a false patriotism or by persecution, or by false signs and anti-Christian seductions. The fut. κτήσεσθε in A. B. is probably a correction of the aor. κτήσασθε (T. R.). The imper. signifies: "Embrace the means which seem the way to lose everything . . . and ye shall save yourselves." Κτᾶσθαι does not mean *to possess* (Osterwald), but *to acquire*. The word suggests that of Jeremiah, *I will give thee thy life for a prey*. And now at length comes the contrast: the time when it will be necessary to leave the passive attitude for that of action (ὅταν δέ, *but when*, ver. 20).

Vers. 20–24.[1] *The true Sign, and the Catastrophe.*—"*But when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.* 21. *Then let them which are in Judæa flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the city depart out; and let not them that are in the fields enter thereinto.* 22. *For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.* 23. *But woe unto*

[1] Ver. 21. Marcion omitted vers. 21 and 22.—Ver. 23. 11 Mjj. 30 Mnn. It. Vg. omit ἐν before τῷ λαῷ, which T. R. reads, with 9 Mjj.

them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days; for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. 24. *And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*"—Here is the direct answer to the disciples' question: "When . . . and with what sign?" Jesus up till now has been warning believers not to give way to hasty measures. Now He guards them, on the contrary, against the illusions of fanatical Jews, who to the end will cherish the belief that God will not fail to save Jerusalem by a miracle. "By no means, answers Jesus; be assured in that hour that all is over, and that destruction is near and irrevocable." The sign indicated by Luke is the investment of Jerusalem by a hostile army. We see nothing to hinder us from regarding this sign as identical in sense with that announced by Matthew and Mark in Daniel's words (in the LXX.): *the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place.* Why not understand thereby the Gentile standards planted on the sacred soil which surrounds the holy city? Luke has substituted for the obscure prophetic expression a term more intelligible to Gentiles. It has often been concluded from this substitution, that Luke had modified the form of Jesus' saying under the influence of the event itself, and that consequently he had written after the destruction of Jerusalem. But if Jesus really predicted, as we have no doubt He did, the taking of Jerusalem, the substitution of Luke's term for the synonym of Daniel might have been made *before* the event as easily as after. Keim sees in the expression of the other Syn. the announcement of a simple *profanation* of the temple, like that of Antiochus Epiphanes,—a prediction which, according to him, was not fulfilled. But in this case we must establish a contradiction between this threat and that of the entire destruction of the temple (Matt. ver. 6; Mark, ver. 2), which is purely arbitrary!

This utterance preserved the church of Palestine from the infatuation which, from the beginning of the war, seized upon the whole Jewish nation. Remembering the warning of Jesus of the approach of the Roman armies, the Christians of Judæa fled to Pella beyond Jordan, and thus escaped the catastrophe (Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 5, ed. Læmmer). They applied the ex-

pression, *the mountains* (ver. 21), to the mountainous plateaus of Gilead.—Ver. 21. "*Let those who dwell in the capital not remain there, and let those who dwell in the country not take refuge in it.*" The inhabitants of the country ordinarily seek their safety behind the walls of the capital. But in this case, this is the very point on which the whole violence of the storm will break. Ver. 22 gives the reason of this dispensation. Comp. xi. 50, 51.—Ver. 23 exhibits the difficulty of flight in such circumstances. Luke here omits the saying of Matthew about the impossibility of flight *on the Sabbath*, which had no direct application to Gentiles.—*The land* should be taken in the restricted sense which we give the word, *the country*.—St Paul seems to allude to the expression, *wrath upon this people*, in Rom. ii. 5–8 and 1 Thess. ii. 16.—Ver. 24. A million of Jews perished in this war; 97,000 were led captive to Egypt and the other provinces of the empire (Josephus). The term πατουμένη, *trodden*, denotes more than taking possession; it is the oppression and contempt which follow conquest; comp. Rev. xi. 2. This unnatural state of things will last till the end of the *times of the Gentiles*. What means this expression peculiar to Luke? According to Meyer and Bleek, nothing more than: the time of Gentile dominion over Jerusalem. But would it not be a tautology to say: Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles until the time of Gentile dominion come to an end? Then the plural καιροί, *the times*, is not sufficiently accounted for on this view. Neither is the choice of the term καιρός, *the opportunity*, instead of χρόνος, a certain space of time. In the passage xix. 44, *the time of Israel*, καιρός denotes the season when God visits this people with the offer of salvation. According to this analogy, *the times of the Gentiles* should designate the whole period during which God shall approach with His grace the Gentiles who have been hitherto strangers to His kingdom. Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 2, the expressions καιρὸς δεκτός, ἡμέρα σωτηρίας. The plural καιροί, *the times*, corresponds with the plural *the nations*; the Gentile peoples are called one after another; hence there arises in this one epoch a plurality of phases.

Modern criticism accuses Luke of having introduced into the discourse of Jesus at his own hand this important idea, which is

wanting in Mark and Matthew (Holtzmann, p. 406). This supposition, indeed, is inevitable, if his work is founded on those two writings or on the documents from which they are drawn, the proto-Mark or the *Logia, e.g.* But if this saying is not found in the other two Syn., the thought which it expresses is very clearly implied. Do they not both speak of the preaching of the gospel to all Gentile peoples (Matt. xxiv. 14), and of a baptism to be brought to *every creature* (Mark xvi. 15; Matt. xxviii. 19)? Such a work demands time. Gess refers also to Mark xii. 9; Matt. xxi. 43, and xxii. 18, where Jesus declares that the kingdom of God will pass for a time to the Gentiles, and that they will bring forth the fruits thereof, and where He describes the invitation which shall be addressed to them with this view by the servants of the Master (parable of the marriage supper). All this work necessarily supposes a special period in history. Can Jesus have thought of this period as *before* the destruction of Jerusalem? We have already proved the falsity of this assertion. When, therefore, in Luke Jesus inserts *the times of the Gentiles* between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia, He says nothing but what is implied in His utterances quoted by the other two Syn., necessary in itself, and consequently in keeping with His real thought. That established, is it not very arbitrary to affect suspicion of Luke's saying in which this idea is positively expressed?—This era of the Gentiles was a notion foreign to the O. T. For, in the prophetic view, the end of the theocracy always coincided with that of the present world. We can thus understand how, in the reproduction of Jesus' sayings within the bosom of the Judeo-Christian Church, this notion, unconnected with anything in their past views, could be effaced, and disappear from that oral proclamation of the gospel which determined the form of our two first Syn. In possession of more exact written documents, Luke here, as in so many other cases, restored the sayings of Jesus to their true form. If Jesus, who fixed so exactly the time of the *destruction of Jerusalem* (*"this generation shall not pass till . . ."*), declared in the same discourse that He did not Himself know *the day of His coming* (Mark xiii. 32), it must infallibly have been because He placed a longer or shorter interval between those two events,—an interval which is precisely the period of the Gentiles. Is not this explanation more probable than that which, contrary to all psychological possibility, ascribes to Luke so strange a *licence*[1] as that of *deliberately* putting into his Master's mouth sayings which He never uttered?

Vers. 25–27.[2] *The Parousia.*—*"And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and in the earth distress of nations with perplexity; the sea and the waves roar-*

[1] Holtzmann, on occasion of the piece vers. 25–36, says in speaking of Luke: *"Noch weiter geht die Licenz . . ."* (p. 237).

[2] Ver. 25. ℵ B L Δ, ἔσονται instead of ἔσται.—Alexn. It., Vg., ἤχους instead of ἤχους (T, R, Byz).

ing; 26. *Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken.* 27. *And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.*"—We have found that the main subject of this discourse was the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem. But how could our Lord close the treatment of this subject, and the mention of the epoch of the Gentiles which was to follow this catastrophe, without terminating by indicating the Parousia, the limit of the prophetic perspective? The mention which He made in passing of this last event, which was to consummate the judgment of the world begun by the former, doubtless contributed to the combination of the two subjects, and to the confounding of the two discourses in tradition.—The intermediate idea, therefore, between vers. 24 and 25 is this: "And when those times of the period of grace granted to the Gentiles shall be at an end, then there shall be . . .;" then follows the summary description of the Parousia. Those two judgments, that of the theocracy and that of the world, which Luke separates by the times of the Gentiles, are closely connected in Matthew by the εὐθέως, *immediately*, ver. 29, and by the words following: *after the tribulation of those days*, which cannot well refer to anything else than the *great tribulation* mentioned ver. 21, that is to say, to the destruction of Jerusalem (vers. 15–20). In fact, the Parousia is mentioned here by Matthew (ver. 27) only to condemn beforehand the lying revelations of false prophets (vers. 23–26) as to the form of that event. In Mark there is the same connection as in Matthew, though somewhat less absolute, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia ("*in those days*," but without the *immediately* of Matthew). The three writers' compilations are, it is easily seen, independent of one another.

Jesus described xvii. 26–30 and xviii. 8 the state of worldliness into which society and the Church itself would sink in the last times. In the midst of this carnal security, alarming symptoms will all at once proclaim one of those universal revolutions through which our earth has more than once passed. Like a ship creaking in every timber at the moment of its going to pieces, the globe which we inhabit (ἡ οἰκουμένη), and our whole solar system, shall undergo unusual

commotions. The moving forces (*δυνάμεις*), regular in their action till then, shall be as it were set free from their laws by an unknown power; and at the end of this violent but short distress, the world shall see Him appear whose coming shall be like the lightning which shines from one end of heaven to the other (xvii. 24). The *cloud* is here, as almost everywhere in Scripture, the symbol of judgment. The gathering of the elect, placed here by Matthew and Mark, is mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, 2 Thess. ii. 1, where the word *ἐπισυναγωγή* reminds us of the *ἐπισυνάγειν* of the two evangelists. Is it not a proof of the falsity of that style of criticism which seeks to explain every difference in text between the Syn. by ascribing to them opposite points of view?—Ver. 27. It is not said that the Lord shall return to the earth to remain there. This coming can be only a momentary appearance, destined to effect the resurrection of the faithful and the ascension of the entire Church (1 Cor. xv. 23; Luke xvii. 31–35; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17).

Vers. 28–36.[1] *The Application.*—"*When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.* 29. *And He spake to them a parable: Behold the fig-tree, and all the trees;* 30. *When they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand.* 31. *So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.* 32. *Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled.* 33. *Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away.* 34. *But take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares.* 35. *For as a snare it shall come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth.* 36. *Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.*"—Jesus draws practical conclusions from the whole of the preceding discourse: 1. In respect of hope, vers. 28–33; 2. In respect of watchfulness, vers. 34–36.

[1] Ver. 33. ℵ. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., *παρελευσονται* instead of *παρελθωσι* (which is taken from Matthew and Mark).—Ver. 35. ℵ. B. D., *δε* instead of *ουν*.—Ver. 36. ℵ. B. L. X. 7 Mnn., *κατισχυσητε* instead of *καταξιωθητε*.—15 Mjj. omit *ταυτα*.

Vers. 28–33. It might be thought that after this saying relative to the Parousia (vers. 26, 27), which is strictly speaking a digression, Jesus returns to the principal topic of this discourse, the destruction of Jerusalem. The expression: *your deliverance*, would then denote the emancipation of the Judeo-Christian Church by the destruction of the persecuting Jewish power. The coming of the *kingdom of God*, ver. 31, would refer to the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles; and ver. 32: *this generation shall not pass away*, would thus indicate quite naturally the date of the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet the fact of the Parousia, once mentioned, is too solemn to be treated as a purely accessory idea. The *kingdom of God* seems, therefore, necessarily to denote here rather the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom; and *the deliverance* (ver. 28) should be applied to the definitive emancipation of the Church by the return of the Lord (the deliverance of the widow, xviii. 1–8). *Of yourselves*, ver. 30: "It is not necessary that an official proclamation announce to the inhabitants of the world that summer is near!" It is about the middle of March that fruits begin to show themselves on the old branches of the spring fig-tree; they reach maturity before the shooting of the leaves. The first harvest is gathered in June (Keim, iii. p. 206).

Can ver. 32 refer still to the Parousia? But in that case, how are we to explain the expression: *this generation?* Jerome understood by it *the human species*, Origen and Chrysostom *the Christian Church*. These explanations are now regarded as forced. That of Dorner and Riggenbach, who take it to mean *the Jewish people* (applying to their conversion the image of the fig-tree flourishing again, vers. 29, 30), is not much more natural. In this context, where we have to do with a chronological determination ("*is nigh*," ver. 31), the meaning of γενεά must be *temporal*. Besides, we have the authentic commentary on this saying in Luke xi. 50, 51, where Jesus declares that it is the very generation which is to shed His blood and that of His messengers, which must suffer, besides, the punishment of all the innocent blood shed since that of Abel down to this last. It is not less false to give to this expression, with the Tübingen School, such an extension that it embraces a period of 70 years (Hilgenfeld),

or even of a century (Volkmar): the duration of a man's life. It has not this meaning among the ancients. In Herod. (2. 142, 7. 171), Heraclitus, and Thuc. (1. 14), it denotes a space of from 30 to 40 years. A century counts three generations. The saying of Irenæus respecting the composition of the Apocalypse, wherein he declares "that this vision was seen not long before his epoch, almost within the time *of our generation*, towards the end of Domitian's reign," does not at all prove the contrary, as Volkmar alleges; for Irenæus says expressly: *σχεδόν, almost*, well aware that he is extending the reach of the term *generation* beyond its ordinary application. An impartial exegesis, therefore, leaves no doubt that this saying fixes the date of the near destruction of Jerusalem at least the third of a century after the ministry of Jesus. The meaning is: "The generation which shall shed this blood shall not pass away till God require it" (in opposition to all the blood of the ancients which has remained so long unavenged). *Πάντα, all things*, refers to all those events precursive of that catastrophe which are enumerated vers. 8–19, and to the catastrophe itself (20–24).—The position of this saying immediately after the preceding verses relative to the Parousia, seems to be in Luke a faint evidence of the influence exercised by that confusion which reigns throughout the whole discourse as related by the other two Syn. There is nothing in that to surprise us. Would not the omission of some word of transition, or the simple displacing of some sentence, suffice to produce this effect? And how many cases of similar transpositions or omissions are to be met with in our Syn.? But if this observation is well founded, it proves that the Gospel of Luke was not composed, any more than the other two, *after* the destruction of Jerusalem.

Heaven and earth (ver. 33) are contrasted with those magnificent structures which His disciples would have Him to admire (ver 5): Here is a very different overthrow from that which they had so much difficulty in believing. This universe, this temple made by the hand of God, passeth away; one thing remains: the threats and promises of the Master who is speaking to them.

Vers. 34–36. Here, as in chap. xii., the life of the disciples is apparently to be prolonged till the Parousia. The reason

is, that that period is ever to remain the point on which the believer's heart should fix (xii. 36); and if, by all the generations which precede the last, this expectation is not realized in its visible form, it has its truth, nevertheless, in the fact of death, that constant individual returning of Jesus which prepares for His general and final advent.—The warning ver. 34 refers to the danger of slumbering, arising from the state of the world in the last times, xvii. 26–30. On the last words of the verse, comp. 1 Thess. v. 1–7.—Ver. 35. The image is that of a net which all at once encloses a covey of birds peacefully settled in a field. *To watch* (ver. 36) is the emblem of constant expectation. With expectation prayer is naturally conjoined under the influence of that grave feeling which is produced by the imminence of the expected advent. The word σταθῆναι, *to stand upright*, indicates the solemnity of the event. A divine power will be needed, if we are not to sink before the Son of man in His glory, and be forced to exclaim: "*Mountains, fall on us!*"

With this discourse before it, the embarrassment of rationalism is great. How explain the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem, if there are no prophecies? that of the Parousia, if Jesus is but a sinful man like ourselves (not to say, with Renan, a fanatic)? Baur and Strauss say: Under the influence of Daniel's extravagant sayings, Jesus could easily predict His return; but He could not announce the destruction of Jerusalem. Hase and Schenkel say: Jesus, as a good politician, might well foresee and predict the destruction of the temple, but (and this is also M. Colani's opinion) it is impossible to make a fanatic of Him announcing His return. Each writer thus determines *à priori* the result of his criticism, according to his own dogmatic conviction. It is perfectly useless to discuss the matter on such bases. Keim recognises the indisputable historical reality of the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem, on the ground of Matt. xxvii. 60 (the false witnesses), and of Acts vi. 11–14 (Stephen), and the truth of the promise of the Parousia as well; the saying Mark xiii. 32 is a proof of it which cannot be evaded. Nevertheless, agreeing in part with M. Colani, he regards the discourse Matt. xxiv. as the composition of an author much later than the ministry of Jesus, who has improved upon some actual words of His. This apocalyptic poem, Jewish according to Weizsäcker, Judeo-Christian according to Colani and Keim, was written shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The following are our objections to this hypothesis: 1. It is not in this discourse only that Jesus announces the catastrophe of Israel, and appends the extraordinary assertion of His return. On the

destruction of Jerusalem, read again Matt. xxi. 44, Luke xix. 42–44, Mark xi. 14, 20, xii. 9, etc. etc.; and on the Parousia, Matt. vii. 21–23, xix. 28, xxv. 31–46, xxvi. 63, 64, Luke ix. 26 and parall., xiii. 23–27, etc. How could those numerous declarations, which we find scattered over different parts of our Syn. Gospels, be all borrowed from this alleged apocalyptic poem? 2. How could a private composition have obtained such general authority, under the very eyes of the apostles or their first disciples, that it found admission into our three Syn. Gospels as an authentic saying of our Lord? Was ever a pure poem transformed into an exact and solemn discourse, such as that expressly put by our three evangelists at this determinate historical time into the mouth of Jesus? Such a hypothesis is nothing else than a stroke of desperation.

Volkmar finds in this discourse, as everywhere, the result of the miserable intrigues of the Christian parties. John the apostle had published in 68 the great reverie of the Apocalypse. He still hoped for the preservation of the temple (Rev. xi. 1 et seq.), which proves that he had never heard his Master announce its destruction. Five years later, in 73, Mark composes another Apocalypse, intended to rectify the former. He elaborates it from the Pauline standpoint; he rejects its too precise dates, and the details which had been hazarded, but which the event had proved false; the fixing, *e.g.*, of the three years and a half which were to extend to the Parousia, a date for which he prudently substitutes the saying: "As to that day, even I myself know it not," etc. Such is the origin of the great eschatological discourse in the Syn., the most ancient monument of which is Mark xiii. But, 1. This alleged dogmatic contrast between the discourse Mark xiii. and the Apocalypse, exists only in the mind of Volkmar; the latter celebrates the conversion of the Gentiles with the same enthusiasm as the former foretells it. 2. The composition of the Apocalypse in 68 is an hypothesis, the falsehood of which we have, as we think, demonstrated.[1] 3. It is utterly false that the Apocalypse teaches the preservation of the temple of Jerusalem. The description xi. 1 et seq., if it is to be rescued from absurdity, must necessarily be taken in a figurative sense, as we have also demonstrated.[2] 4. Certainly the poetical representations of the Apocalypse were not the original of the simple, concise, prosaic expressions of the discourse of Jesus in the Syn.; it was these, on the contrary, which served as a canvas for the rich delineations of the Apocalypse. Is it not evident that the literal terms *war*, *famine*, *pestilence*, *earthquakes*, in the mouth of Jesus (Luke xxi. 9–11 and parall.), are amplified and developed into the form of complete visions in the apocalyptic seals (*war*, in Rev. vi. 3, 4; *famine*, in vers. 5, 6; *pestilence*, in vers. 7, 8; *earthquake*, in vers. 12–17; comp. also the *persecutions* foretold Luke v. 16, 17, with Rev. vi. 9–11, and the false Christs and prophets predicted Matt. xxiv. 24, with Rev. xiii.)? The inverse procedure, the return from

[1] *Bulletin Théologique*, 1865, pp. 236–249. [2] *Ib.* p. 242.

the elaborate to the simple, from the Apocalypse to the Gospels, is in its very nature inadmissible. The composition of Jesus' discourse in the Syn. is therefore anterior to that of the Apocalypse, and not the reverse. 5. The historical declaration of Jesus in Mark: "Of that day knoweth no man, not even the Son," is confirmed by Matt. xxiv. 36 and Mark xiii. 35. It results from the very contents of this marvellous saying. Who would have thought, at the time when the conviction of the Lord's divinity was making way with so much force in the Church, and when Jesus was represented in this very discourse as the universal Judge, of putting into His mouth a saying which seemed to bring Him down to the level of other human beings? Such a saying must have rested on the most authentic tradition. 6. We have proved the mutual *independence* of the three synoptical accounts. The origin of this discourse of Jesus was therefore, no doubt, apostolical tradition circulating in the Church, agreeably to Luke i. 1, 2.

Jesus then called Himself, and consequently either *knew* or *believed* Himself to be, the future Judge of the Church and the world. In the former case, He must be something more than a sinful man—He can be only the God-man; in the latter, He is only a fool carried away with pride. In vain will MM. Colani, Volkmar, and Keim attempt to escape from this dilemna. Genuine historical criticism and an impartial exegesis will always raise it anew, and allow no other choice than between the Christ of the Church and the clever *charmer* of M. Renan.

What conclusion should be drawn from this discourse as to the date when our Syn., and Luke in particular, were composed? De Wette has justly concluded, from the close connection which this discourse, as we have it in Matthew, fixes between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia, that this Gospel must have been composed before the former of those two events. And, in truth, it requires all Volkmar's audacity to attempt to prove the contrary by means of that very εὐθέως, *immediately* (xxiv. 29), which so directly, as we have seen, connects the second event with the first. But if this conclusion is well founded in regard to the first Gospel, it is not less applicable to the second, which in this respect is in exactly the same circumstances as the first. As to Luke, it has often been inferred from the well-marked distinction kept up between the two subjects and the two discourses (Parousia, chap. xvii.; destruction of Jerusalem, chap. xxi.), that he wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the interval between the two events was historically established. Rational as this conclusion may appear at first sight, it is nevertheless unfounded. For, 1. Luke himself, as we have seen at ver. 32, is not wholly exempt from the confusion which prevails in the other two. 2. If Jesus in His own judgment distinctly separated those two events, why might He not have spoken of them Himself in two separate discourses; and why might not Luke, in this case as in many others, have simply reproduced the historical fact from more exact originals (i. 3, 4)?

3. *General View of the Situation:* vers. 37, 38.[1] — The preceding discourse was delivered by Jesus on the Tuesday or Wednesday evening. Luke here characterizes our Lord's mode of living during the last days of His life. *Αὐλίζεσθαι:* to pass the night in the open air. The use of the εἰς arises from the idea of motion contained in ἐξερχόμενος (Bleek).—4 Mnn. place here, after ver. 38, the account of the woman taken in adultery, which in a large number of documents is found John vii. 53–viii. 11. We can only see in this piece, in Luke as well as in John, an interpolation; doubtless owing to some marginal note taken by a copyist from the Gospel of the Hebrews, and which in some MSS. had found its way into the text of the Gospel. As to the rest, this narrative would stand much better in Luke than in John. It has a close bond of connection with the contents of chap. xx (the snares laid for Jesus). And an event of this kind may have actually occurred in the two or three days which are summarily described in vers. 37 and 38.

[1] Ver. 38. 4 Mnn. add at the end of this verse, *και απηλθον εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου*, then the narrative John viii. 1–11.

SIXTH PART.

THE PASSION.

CHAP. XXII. AND XXIII.

THE Saviour had taken up a truly royal attitude in the temple. Now this short anticipation of His kingdom, the normal blossoming of His prophetic activity, is over; and limiting Himself to a silence and passivity which have earned for this period the name of the Passion, He exercises that terrestrial priesthood which was to be the transition from His prophetic ministry to His celestial sovereignty.

We find in the fourth Gospel (chap. xii.) a scene which must have occurred on one of the days referred to by Luke xxi. 37, 38, the discourse which Jesus uttered in the temple in answer to the question of some Greek proselytes who had desired to converse with Him, and the divine manifestation which took place on that occasion. Then it is said, "*And He departed, and did hide Himself from them*" (ver. 36). This departure could not be that of Matt. xxiv. 1 (parall. Luke xxi. 5). The scene which precedes differs too widely. It took place, therefore, one or two days later; and this supposition agrees with the meaning of the last two verses of chap. xxi., which forbid us to believe that after the eschatological discourse Jesus did not reappear in the temple. Thus, if we place the entry into Jerusalem on Sunday afternoon, the purification of the temple on Monday (Mark), the captious questions put to Him on Tuesday, and the prophecy respecting the destruction of Jerusalem on the evening of that day, the temple scene related John xii. may have occurred on Wednesday; in which case, Jesus would pass the last day, Thursday, in His retreat

at Bethany with His disciples. If it is alleged, with Bleek, that the entry on Palm Day took place on Monday, each of the events mentioned is put back a day; and the temple scene falling in this case on Thursday, Jesus must, on the contrary, have passed this last day, like all the rest, at Jerusalem. Whatever Keim may say, who alleges two days of complete retirement, Wednesday and Thursday, everything considered, we regard the second supposition as the simplest.

The narrative of the Passion comprehends:—I. The preparation for the Passion (xxii. 1–46). II. The Passion (xxii. 47–xxiii. 46). III. The events following the Passion (xxiii. 47–56).

FIRST CYCLE.—CHAP. XXII. 1–46.

The Preparation for the Passion.

This cycle comprehends the three following events:—Judas preparing for the Passion by selling Jesus; Jesus preparing His disciples for it at His last supper; His preparing Himself for it by prayer in Gethsemane.

I. *The Treachery of Judas:* xxii. 1–6.—Vers. 1–6.[1] The resolution of the Sanhedrim was taken. The only question for it henceforth was that of the *how* (τὸ πῶς, ver. 2). Its perplexity arose from the extraordinary favour which Jesus enjoyed with the people, particularly with the crowds who had come from Galilee and from abroad; the rulers feared a popular rising on the part of those numerous friends who had come from a distance with Him, and of whom they did not feel themselves the masters, as they did of the population of Jerusalem. So, according to Matthew and Mark, they said in their conclaves, "*Not during the feast,*" which may signify either *before,* ere the multitudes are fully assembled, or *after,* when they shall have departed, and they shall be again masters of the field. But it was in exact keeping with the divine plan that Jesus should die *during* the feast (ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ); and the perfidy of Judas, the means which the rulers thought they

[1] Ver. 3. A. B. D. L. X., καλουμενον instead of επικαλουμενον.—Ver. 4. C. P. 10 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, add και τοις γραμματευσιν after τοις αρχιερευσιν.—C. P. 9 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. add του ιερου after στρατηγοις.—Ver. 5. The Mss. are divided between αργυριον and αργυρια.—Ver. 6. ℵ* C. It^{plerique}, omit και εξωμολογησεν.

could use to attain their end, was that of which God made use to attain His.

It appears from Matt. xxvi. 2 and Mark xiv. 1 that it was Wednesday when the negotiation between Judas and the Sanhedrim took place. Luke and Mark omit the words of Jesus (Matthew), "*In two days is the Passover . . .*" But those *two days* appear in Mark in the form of the narrative.—The word *Passover*, τὸ πάσχα, from פסח, in Aramaic פסחא, signifies a *passing*, and commemorates the manner in which the Israelites were spared in Egypt when the Almighty *passed* over their houses, sprinkled with the blood of the lamb, without slaying their first-born. This name, which originally denoted the lamb, was applied later to the Supper itself, then to the entire feast. The Passover was celebrated in the first month, called *Nisan*, from the 15th of the month, the day of full moon, to the 21st. This season corresponds to the end of March and beginning of April. The feast opened on the evening which closed the 14th and began the 15th, with the Paschal Supper. Originally every father, in virtue of the priesthood belonging to every Israelite, sacrificed his lamb himself at his own house. But since the Passover celebrated by Josiah, the lambs were sacrificed in the temple, and with the help of the priests. This act took place on the afternoon of the 14th, from three to six o'clock. Some hours after the Supper began, which was prolonged far into the night. This Supper opened the feast of *unleavened bread* (ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, ver. 1), which, according to the law, lasted the seven following days. The first and last (15th and 21st) were sabbatic. The intermediate days were not hallowed by acts of worship and sacrifices; work was lawful. As Josephus expressly says that the feast of unleavened bread lasted *eight* days, agreeing with our Syn., who make it begin on the 14th (ver. 7; Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12), and not on the 15th, we must conclude that in practice the use of unleavened bread had been gradually extended to the 14th. To the present day, it is on the night between the 13th and 14th that all leaven is removed from Israelitish houses.

Luke, ver. 3, ascribes the conduct of Judas to a Satanic influence. He goes the length of saying that Satan *entered into him*. He means to remark here, in a general way, the

intervention of that superior agent in this extraordinary crime; while John, seeking to characterize its various *degrees*, more exactly distinguishes the time when Satan put into the heart of Judas the first thought of it (comp. xiii. 2), and the moment when he *entered into him* so as to take entire possession of his will (xiii. 27). According to the biblical view, this intervention of Satan did not at all exclude the liberty of Judas. This disciple, in joining the service of Jesus, had not taken care to deny his own life, as Jesus so often urged His own to do. Jesus, instead of becoming the end to his heart, had remained the means. And now, when he saw things terminating in a result entirely opposed to that with which he had ambitiously flattered himself, he wished at least to try to benefit by the false position into which he had put himself with his nation, and to use his advantages as a disciple in order to regain the favour of the rulers with whom he had broken. The thirty pieces of silver certainly played only a secondary part in his treachery, although this part was real notwithstanding; for the epithet thief (John xii. 6) is given to him with the view of putting his habitual conduct in connection with this final act.—Matthew and Mark insert here the narrative of the feast at Bethany, though it must have taken place some days before (John). The reason for this insertion is an association of ideas arising from the moral relation between these two particulars in which the avarice of Judas showed itself.—The *στρατηγοί, captains* (ver. 4), are the heads of the soldiery charged with keeping guard over the temple (Acts iv. 1). There was a positive contract (*they covenanted, he promised*). Ἄτερ, not *at a distance* from the multitude, but *without* a multitude; that is to say, without any flocking together produced by the occasion. This wholly unexpected offer determined the Sanhedrim to act *before* rather than *after* the feast. But in order to that, it was necessary to make haste; the last moment had come.

II. *The Last Supper:* xxii. 7–38.—We find ourselves here face to face with a difficulty which, since the second century of the Church, has arrested the attentive readers of the Scriptures. As it was on the 14th Nisan, in the afternoon, that the Paschal lamb was sacrificed, that it might be eaten the evening of the same day, it has been customary to take the

time designated by the words, ver. 7, *Then came the day of unleavened bread when the Passover must be killed* (comp. Matthew and Mark), as falling on the morning of that 14th day; from which it would follow that the Supper, related ver. 14 et seq., took place the evening between the 14th and 15th. This view seems to be confirmed by the parallels Matt. xxvi. 17, Mark xiv. 12, where the disciples (not Jesus, as in Luke) take the initiative in the steps needed for the Supper. If such was the fact, it appeared that the apostles could not have been occupied with the matter till the morning of the 14th. But thereby the explanation came into conflict with John, who seems to say in a considerable number of passages that Jesus was *crucified* on the afternoon of the 14th, at the time when they were slaying the lamb in the temple, which necessarily supposes that the last Supper of Jesus with His disciples took place the evening between the 13th and 14th, the eve before that on which Israel celebrated the Paschal Supper, and not the evening between the 14th and 15th. This seeming contradiction does not bear on the day of the *week* on which Jesus was crucified. According to our four Gospels, this day was indisputably Friday. The difference relates merely to the day of the *month*, but on that very account, also, to the relation between the last Supper of Jesus at which He instituted the Eucharist, and the Paschal feast of that year. Many commentators—Wieseler, Hofmann, Lichtenstein, Tholuck, Riggenbach—think that they can identify the meaning of John's passages with the idea which at first sight appears to be that of the synoptical narrative; Jesus, according to John as according to the Syn., celebrated His last Supper on the evening of the 14th, and instituted the Holy Supper while celebrating the Passover conjointly with the whole people. We have explained in our *Commentaire sur l'évangile de Jean* the reasons which appear to us to render this solution impossible.[1] The arguments advanced since then by the learned Catholic theologian Langen, and by the eminent philologist Bäumlein, have not changed our conviction.[2] The meaning which presents itself first to the mind

[1] See at xiii. 1, xviii. 28, xix. 14; and the special dissertation, t. ii. pp. 629–636.

[2] Langen, *Die letzten Lebenstage Jesu*, 1864; Bäumlein, *Commentar über das*

on reading John's Gospel, is and remains the only possible one, exegetically speaking. But it may and should be asked in return, What is the *true* meaning of the synoptical narrative, and its relation to John's account thus understood? Such is the point which we proceed to examine as we study more closely the text of Luke.

The narrative of Luke embraces: 1. The preparation for the feast (vers. 7–13); 2. The feast itself (vers. 14–23); 3. The conversations which followed the feast (vers. 24–38).

1. *The Preparations:* vers. 7–13.[1] — There is a marked difference between the ἦλθε, *came*, of ver. 7, and the ἤγγιζε, *drew nigh*, of ver. 1. The word *drew nigh* placed us one or two days before the Passover; the word *came* denotes the beginning of the day on which the lamb was killed, the 14th. Is this time, as is ordinarily supposed, the *morning* of the 14th? But after the Jewish mode of reckoning, the 14th began at even, about six o'clock. The whole night between the 13th and 14th, in our language, belonged to the 14th. How, then, could the word *came* apply to a time when the entire first half of the day was already past? The *came* of ver. 7 seems to us, therefore, to denote what in our language we should call the evening of the 13th (among the Jews the

Evangelium Johannis, 1863. Both apply the expression, *before the feast of Passover* (John xiii. 1), to the evening of the 14th, making the feast of Passover, properly so called, begin on the morning of the 15th. Langen justifies this way of speaking by Deut. xvi. 6, where he translates: "At the *rising* of the sun (instead of at the *going down* of the sun) is the feast of the coming forth out of Egypt." This translation is contrary to the analogy of Gen. xxviii. 11, etc. The passage of Josephus which he adds (*Antiq.* iii. 10. 5) has as little force. We think that we have demonstrated how insufficient is Deut. xvi. 2 to justify that interpretation of John xviii. 28 which would reduce the meaning of the phrase, *to eat the Passover*, to the idea of eating the unleavened bread and the sacrificial viands of the Paschal week. As to John xix. 14, there is no doubt that, as Langen proves, the N. T. (Mark xv. 42), the Talmud, and the Fathers use the term παρασκευή, *preparation*, to denote *Friday* as the weekly preparation for the Sabbath, and that, consequently, in certain contexts the expression παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, *preparation of the Passover*, might signify the Friday of the Passover week. But this meaning is excluded in John: *1st.* By the ambiguity which the expression must have presented to the mind of his Greek readers; *2d.* By the fact that no reader of the Gospel could be ignorant that the narrative lay in the Paschal week.

[1] Ver. 7. B. C. D. L. omit ἐν before ᾗ.—Ver. 10. ℵ. B. C. L., εἰς ἣν instead of ἐν or ἐν ᾧ ἐαν.—Ver. 12. Instead of ἀνωγεον (T. R. with X. Γ.), 4 Mjj. ἀνωγαῖον, the others ἀναγαιον.—ℵ. L. X., κακει instead of ἐκει.—Ver. 13. ℵ. B. C. D. L., εἰρηκει instead of εἰρηκεν.

time of transition from the 13th to the 14th, from four to six o'clock). The expressions of Matthew and Mark, without being so precise, do not necessarily lead to a different meaning. Indeed, the expression of Mark, ver. 12, does not signify, "*at the time when* they killed . . .," but "*the day when* they . . ." But may we place on the 13th, in the evening, the command of Jesus to His two disciples to prepare the feast for the morrow? That is not only possible, but necessary. On the morning of the 14th, it would have been too late to think of procuring an apartment for that very evening. Strauss fully acknowledges this:[1] "In consequence of the flocking of pilgrims from a distance, it was of course difficult, and even impossible, to find on the morning of the first day of the feast (the 14th), for the very evening, a room not yet taken up." Places were then taken at least a day in advance. Clement of Alexandria, on this account, gives the 13th the name of προετοιμασία, *pro-preparation*. The 14th was *the preparation*, because on that day the lamb was killed; the 13th, the *pro-preparation*, because, as Clement says, on that day they consecrated the unleavened bread, and took all the other steps necessary for the Paschal feast.[2] Hence it follows, that the question put by Matthew and Mark into the mouth of the disciples, "*Where wilt Thou that we prepare the Passover?*" *must* likewise be placed on the evening of the 13th, which for the Jews was already passing into the 14th. It matters little, therefore, so far as this question is concerned, whether the initiative be ascribed to Jesus (Luke) or to the disciples (Matthew and Mark). As to the rest, on this point the narrative of Luke is evidently the most precise and exact, for he also, ver. 9, relates the question of the disciples, but replacing it in its true position. Luke alone mentions the names of the two apostles chosen. He must have borrowed this detail from a private source—at least if he did not invent it! In any case, the fact would not agree very well with his alleged habitual animosity against St. Peter.[3] Jesus must

[1] *Leben Jesu für d. d. Volk*, p. 533.

[2] "On this day (the 13th) took place the consecration of the unleavened bread and the pro-preparation of the feast."—(Fragment of his book, περὶ τοῦ πάσχα, preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*.)

[3] So small a thing does not trouble Baur! Here, according to him, we have

have had an object in specially choosing those two disciples. We shall see, in fact, that this was a confidential mission, which could be trusted to none but His surest and most intimate friends. — If it was between four and six o'clock in the evening, the apostles had yet time to execute their commission before night, whether they had passed the day in the city, and Jesus left them to do it when He Himself was starting for Bethany with the purpose of returning later to Jerusalem, or whether He had passed the whole of this last day at Bethany, and sent them from the latter place.

Why does Jesus not describe to them more plainly (vers. 10–12) the host whom He has in view? There is but one answer: He wishes the house where He reckons on celebrating the feast to remain unknown to those who surround Him at the time when He gives this order. This is why, instead of describing it, He gives the sign indicated. Jesus knew the projects of Judas; the whole narrative of the feast which follows proves this; and He wished, by acting in this way, to escape from the hindrances which the treachery of His disciple might have put in His way in the use which He desired to make of this last evening.—The sign indicated, a man drawing water from a fountain, is not so accidental as it appears. On the evening of the 13th, *before the stars appeared in the heavens*, every father, according to Jewish custom, had to repair to the fountain to draw pure water with which to knead the unleavened bread. It was, in fact, a rite which was carried through to the words: "This is the water of unleavened bread." Then a torch was lighted, and during some following part of the night the house was visited, and searched in every corner, to put away the smallest vestige of leaven. There is thus a closer relation than appears between the sign and its meaning.—Here is a new proof of the supernatural knowledge of Jesus. The fact is omitted in Matthew. As usual, this evangelist abridges the narrative of facts. Probably Jesus knew the master of the house mentioned ver. 11, and had already asked this service of him conditionally (ver. 12). Ἀνάγαιον (in the Attic form, ἀνώγεων), the upper room, which

a malicious notice from Luke, who wishes to indicate those two chiefs of the Twelve as the representatives of ancient Judaism (!).

sometimes occupies a part of the terrace of the house. *All furnished:* provided with the necessary divans and tables (the *triclinium*, in the shape of a horse-shoe).

Matthew (xxvi. 18) has preserved to us, in the message of Jesus to the master of the house, a saying which deserves to be weighed: "*My time is at hand; let me keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples.*" How does the first of those two propositions form a ground for the request implied in the second? Commentators have seen in the first an appeal to the owner's sensibilities: I am about to die; grant me this last service. Ewald somewhat differently: Soon I shall be in my glory, and I shall be able to requite thee for this service. These explanations are far-fetched. We can explain the thought of Jesus, if those words express the necessity under which He finds Himself laid, by the nearness of His death, *to anticipate* the celebration of the Passover: "My death is near; to-morrow it will be too late for me to keep the Passover; let me celebrate it at thy house [this evening] with my disciples." Ποιῶ is not the att. fut. (Bleek), but the present (Winer): "Let me keep it *immediately*." It was a call to the owner instantly to prepare the room, and everything which was necessary for the feast. The two disciples were to make those preparations in conjunction with the host. No doubt the lamb could not be slain in the temple; but could Jesus, being excommunicated with all His adherents, and already even laid under sentence of arrest by the Sanhedrim (John xi. 53–57), have had His lamb slain on the morrow in the legal form? That is far from probable. Jesus is about to substitute the new Passover for the old. How should He not have the right to free Himself from the letter of the ordinance? all the more that, according to the original institution, every father was required himself to slay the Paschal lamb in his dwelling. He freed Himself in like manner from the law as to the *day*. He is forced, indeed, to do so, if He wishes Himself to substitute the new feast for the old. The decision of the Sanhedrim to put Him to death *before* the feast (Matt. xxvi. 5), leaves Him no choice. This entire state of things agrees with the expression which John uses: δείπνου γενομένου, *a supper having* taken place (xiii. 2).

2. *The Supper:* vers. 14–23.—There are three elements

which form the material of this narrative in the three Syn.: 1*st.* The expression of the personal feelings of Jesus. With this Luke begins, and Matthew and Mark close. 2*d.* The institution of the Holy Supper. It forms the centre of the narrative in the three Syn. 3*d.* The disclosure of the betrayal, and the indication of the traitor. With this Luke ends, and Matthew and Mark begin. It is easy to see how deeply the facts themselves were impressed on the memory of the witnesses, but how secondary the interest was which tradition attached to chronological order. The myth, on the contrary, would have created the whole of a piece, and the result would be wholly different. Luke's order appears preferable. It is natural for Jesus to begin by giving utterance to His personal impressions, vers. 15–18. With the painful feeling of approaching separation there is connected, by an easily understood bond, the institution of the Holy Supper, that sign which is in a way to perpetuate Christ's visible presence in the midst of His own after His departure, vers. 19, 20. Finally, the view of the close communion contracted by this solemn act between the disciples, causes the feeling of the contrast between them and Judas, so agonizing to Him, to break forth into expression. Such is the connection of the third part. It is far from probable, as it seems to us, that Jesus *began* by speaking of this last subject (Matthew and Mark). John omits the first two elements. The first was not essential to his narrative. The second, the institution of the Holy Supper, was sufficiently well known from tradition. We have, in our *Commentaire sur l'évangile de Jean*, placed this latter event at the time indicated by xiii. 2 in that Gospel (δείπνου γενομένου). The feet-washing which followed necessarily coincides with the indication of the traitor in Luke, and with the subsequent conversation, ver. 24 et seq.; and the two accounts thus meet in the common point, the prediction of Peter's denial (Luke, ver. 31; John, ver. 38).

As in what follows there are repeated allusions to the rites of the Paschal Supper, we must rapidly trace the outlines of that Supper as it was celebrated in our Saviour's time. First step: After prayer, the father of the house sent round a cup full of wine (according to others, each one had his cup), with this invocation: "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, King of

the world, who hast created the fruit of the vine!" Next there were passed from one to another the bitter herbs (a sort of salad), which recalled to mind the sufferings of the Egyptian bondage. These were eaten after being dipped in a reddish sweet sauce (*Charoseth*), made of almonds, nuts, figs, and other fruits; commemorating, it is said, by its colour the hard labour of brick-making imposed on the Israelites, and by its taste, the divine alleviations which Jehovah mingles with the miseries of His people.—Second step: The father circulates a second cup, and then explains, probably in a more or less fixed liturgical form, the meaning of the feast, and of the rites by which it is distinguished.—Third step: The father takes two unleavened loaves (cakes), breaks one of them, and places the pieces of it on the other. Then, uttering a thanksgiving, he takes one of the pieces, dips it in the sauce, and eats it, taking with it a piece of the Paschal lamb, along with bitter herbs. Each one follows his example. This is the feast properly so called. The lamb forms the principal dish. The conversation is free. It closes with the distribution of a third cup, called the *cup of blessing*, because it was accompanied with the giving of thanks by the father of the house. —Fourth step: The father distributes a fourth cup; then the *Hallel* is sung (Ps. cxiii.–cxviii.). Sometimes the father added a fifth cup, which was accompanied with the singing of the *great Hallel* (Ps. cxx.–cxxvii.; according to others, cxxxv.–cxxxvii.; according to Delitzsch, Ps. cxxxvi.).[1]

Must it be held, with Langen, that Jesus began by celebrating the entire Jewish ceremony, in order *to connect* with it thereafter the Christian Holy Supper; or did He *transform*, as He went along, the Jewish Supper in such a way as to convert it into the sacred Supper of the N. T.? This second view seems to us the only tenable one. For, 1. It was *during* the course of the feast, ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν (Matthew and Mark), and not *after* the feast (as Luke says in speaking of the only cup), that the bread of the Holy Supper must have been distributed. 2. The singing of the hymn spoken of by Mark and Matthew can only be that of the Hallel, and it *followed* the institution of the Holy Supper.

[1] This ritual is very variously described by those who have given attention to the subject. We have followed the account of Langen, p. 147 et seq.

1*st.* Vers. 14–18.[1] Jesus opens the feast by communicating to the disciples His present impressions. This first step corresponds to the first of the Paschal feast. *The hour* (ver. 14) is that which He had indicated to His disciples, and which probably coincided with the usual hour of the sacred feast. According to the law (Ex. xii. 17), the Passover should have been eaten standing. But custom had introduced a change in this particular. Some Rabbins pretend to justify this deviation, by saying that to stand is the posture of a slave; that, once restored to liberty by the going forth from Egypt, Israel was called to eat sitting. The explanation is ingenious, but devised after the fact. The real reason was, that the feast had gradually taken larger proportions.—There is in the first saying of Jesus, which Luke alone has preserved (ver. 15), a mixture of profound joy and sorrow. Jesus is glad that He can celebrate this holy feast once more, which He has determined by His own instrumentality to transform into a permanent memorial of His person and work; but on the other hand, it is His last Passover here below. *Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα*, a frequent form in the LXX., corresponding to the Hebrew construction of the inf. absolute with the finite verb. It is a sort of reduplication of the verbal idea. Jesus, no doubt, alludes to all the measures which He has required to take to secure the joy of those quiet hours despite the treachery of His disciple.—Could the expression *this Passover* possibly denote a feast at which the Paschal lamb was wanting, and which was only distinguished from ordinary suppers by unleavened bread? Such is the view of Caspari and Andreæ, and the view which I myself maintained (*Comment. sur Jean*, t. ii. p. 634). Indeed, the number of lambs or kids might turn out to be insufficient, and strangers find themselves in the dilemma either of celebrating the feast without a lamb, or not celebrating the Passover at all. Thus in *Mischnah, Pesachim* 10 there is express mention of a Paschal Supper *without a lamb*, and at which the unleavened bread is alone indispensable.

[1] Ver. 14. ℵ* B. D. Vss. omit δωδεκα.—Ver. 16. 6 Mjj. omit συκεται.—ℵ. B. C. L. 5 Mnn. Vss., αυτο instead of εξ αυτου.—Ver. 17. 6 Mjj. 25 Mnn. add το before ποτηριον (taken from ver. 20).—ℵc B. C. L. M. 8 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., εις εαυτους instead of εαυτοις.—Ver. 18. 5 Mjj. 15 Mnn. omit οτι.—6 Mjj. 15 Mnn. add απο του νυν after πιω.—ℵ. B. F. L. 10 Mnn., ου instead of οτου.

Nevertheless, there is nothing to prevent us from holding that, as we have said, the two disciples prepared the lamb in a strictly private manner. It would be difficult to explain Luke's expression, *to eat this Passover*, without the smallest reference to the lamb at this feast.—By the future Passover in the kingdom of God (ver. 16) might be understood the Holy Supper as it is celebrated in the Church. But the expression, "*I* will not any more eat thereof until . . .," and the parall. ver. 18, do not admit of this spiritualistic interpretation. Jesus means to speak of a new banquet which shall take place after the consummation of all things. The Holy Supper is the bond of union between the Israelitish and typical Passover, which was reaching its goal, and the heavenly and divine feast, which was yet in the distant future. Does not the *spiritual* salvation, of which the Supper is the memorial, form in reality the transition from the *external* deliverance of Israel to that salvation at once *spiritual* and *external* which awaits the glorified Church?

After this simple and touching introduction, Jesus, in conformity with the received custom, passed the first cup (ver. 17), accompanying it with a thanksgiving, in which He no doubt paraphrased freely the invocation uttered at the opening of the feast by the father of the house, and which we have quoted above.—Δεξάμενος, *receiving*, seems to indicate that He took the cup from the hands of one of the attendants who held it out to Him (after having filled it). The distribution (διαμερίσατε) may have taken place in two ways, either by each drinking from the common cup, or by their all emptying the wine of that cup into their own. The Greek term would suit better this second view. Did Jesus Himself drink? The pron. ἑαυτοῖς, *among yourselves*, might seem unfavourable to this idea; yet the words, *I will not drink until . . .*, speak in favour of the affirmative. Was it not, besides, a sign of communion from which Jesus could hardly think of refraining on such an occasion? The expression *fruit of the vine*, ver. 18, was an echo of the terms of the ritual Paschal prayer. In the mouth of Jesus, it expressed the feeling of contrast between the present terrestrial system, and the glorified creation which was to spring from the *palingenesia* (Matt. xix. 28; comp. Rom. viii. 31 et seq.). The phrase, *I will not drink*, corresponds to

the *I will not any more eat* of ver. 16. But there is a gradation. Ver. 16 means, This is my last Passover, the last year of my life; ver. 18, This is my last Supper, my last day. These words are the text from which Paul has taken the commentary, *till He come* (1 Cor. xi. 26). They are probably also the ground into which was wrought the famous tradition of Papias regarding the fabulous vines of the millennial reign. In this example, the difference becomes palpable between the sobriety of the tradition preserved in our Gospels, and the legendary exuberance of that of the times which followed. Ver. 29 of Matthew and 25 of Mark reproduce Luke's saying in a somewhat different form, and one which lends itself still better to the amplification which we find in Papias.

2*d*. Vers. 19, 20.[1] The time when the Holy Supper was instituted seems to us to correspond to the second and third steps of the Paschal feast taken together. With the explanation which the head of the house gave of the meaning of the ceremony, Jesus connected that which He had to give regarding the substitution of His person for the Paschal lamb as the means of salvation, and regarding the difference between the two deliverances. And when the time came at which the father took the unleavened cakes and consecrated them by thanksgiving, to make them, along with the lamb, the memorial of the deliverance from Egypt, Jesus also took the bread, and by a similar consecration, made it the memorial of that salvation which He was about to procure for us. In the expression, *This is my body*, the supposed relation between the body and the bread should not be sought in their *substance*. The appendix: *given for you*, in Luke; *broken for you*, in Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24), indicates the true point of correspondence. No doubt, in Paul, this participle might be a gloss. But an interpolation would have been taken from Luke; they would not have invented this *Hapax-legomenon* κλώμενον. Are we not accustomed to the arbitrary or purely negligent omissions of the Alex. text? I think, therefore, that this participle of Paul, as well as the *given* of Luke, are in the Greek text the necessary paraphrase of the literal Aramaic form, *This is my body for you*, a form which the Greek ear could as little bear as ours. The idea of this κλώμενον is, in any case, taken from

[1] Ver. 20. ℵ. B. L. place και το ποτηριον before ωσαυτως.

the preceding ἔκλασε, and determines the meaning of the formula, *This is my body.* As to the word *is*, which has been so much insisted on, it was not uttered by Jesus, who must have said in Aramaic, *Haggouschmi*, "*This here* [behold] *my body!*" The exact meaning of the notion of *being*, which logically connects this subject with this attribute, can only be determined by the context. Is the point in question an identity of substance, physical or spiritual, or a relation purely symbolical? From the exegetical point of view, if what we have said above about the real point of comparison is well founded, it would be difficult to avoid the latter conclusion. It is confirmed by the meaning of the τοῦτο which follows: "Do *this* in remembrance of me." This pron. can denote nothing but *the act* of breaking, and thus precisely the point which appeared to us the natural link of connection between the bread and the body.—The last words, which contain the institution properly so called of a permanent rite, are wanting in Matthew and Mark. But the certified fact of the regular celebration of the Holy Supper as a feast commemorating the death of Jesus from the most primitive times of the Church, supposes a command of Jesus to this effect, and fully confirms the formula of Paul and Luke. Jesus meant to preserve the Passover, but by renewing its meaning. Matthew and Mark preserved of the words of institution only that which referred to the new *meaning* given to the ceremony. As to the *command* of Jesus, it had not been preserved in the liturgical formula, because it was implied in the very act of celebrating the rite.

A certain interval must have separated the second act of the institution from the first; for Luke says: *After they had supped* (ver. 20), exactly as Paul. Jesus, according to custom, let conversation take free course for some time. After this free interval, He resumed the solemn attitude which He had taken in breaking the bread. So we explain the ὡσαύτως, *likewise.*—The word τὸ ποτήριον, *the cup*, is the object of the two verbs λαβών . . . ἔδωκεν at the beginning of ver. 19. The art. τό is here added, because the cup is already known (ver. 17). This cup certainly corresponded to the third of the Paschal Feast, which bore the name of *cup of blessing.* So St. Paul calls it (1 Cor. x. 16): *the cup of blessing* (εὐλογίας)

which we bless. In this expression of the apostle the word *bless* is repeated, because it is taken in two different senses. In the first instance, it refers to God, whom the Church, like the Israelitish family of old, blesses and adores; in the second, to the cup which the Church consecrates, and which by this religious act becomes to the conscience of believers the memorial of the blood of Jesus Christ. What this cup represents, according to the terms of Paul and Luke, is the new *covenant* between God and man, founded on the shedding of Jesus' blood. In Matthew and Mark, it is the *blood* itself. Jesus can hardly have placed the two forms in juxtaposition, as Langen supposes, who thinks that He said: "Drink ye all of this cup; for it is the cup which contains my blood, the blood of the new covenant." Such a periphrasis is incompatible with the style proper to the institution of a rite, which has always something concise and monumental. There is thus room to choose between the form of Matthew and Mark and that of Paul and Luke. Now, is it not probable that oral tradition and ecclesiastical custom would tend to make the second formula, relative to the wine, uniform with the first, which refers to the bread, rather than to diversify them? Hence it follows, that the greatest historical probability is in favour of the form in which the two sayings of Jesus least resemble one another, that is to say, in favour of that of Paul and Luke.

Every covenant among the ancients was sealed by some symbolic act. The new covenant, which on God's side rests on the free gift of salvation, and on man's side on its acceptance by faith, has henceforth, as its permanent symbol in the Church, this cup which Jesus holds out to His own, and which each of them freely takes and brings to his lips. The O. T. had also been founded on blood (Gen. xv. 8 et seq.). It had been renewed in Egypt by the same means (Ex xii. 22, 23, xxiv. 8). The participle understood between διαθήκη and ἐν τῷ αἵματι is the verbal idea taken from the subst. διαθήκη (διατιθεμένη): *the covenant* [covenanted] *in my blood.* Baur, Volkmar, and Keim think that it is Paul who has here introduced the idea of the *new covenant.* For it would never have entered into the thought of Judeo-Christianity thus to repudiate the old covenant, and proclaim a new one. Mark, even

while copying Paul, designedly weakened this expression, they say, by rejecting the too offensive epithet *new*. Luke, a bolder Paulinist, restored it, thus reproducing Paul's complete formula. And how, we must ask, did Jesus express Himself? Was He incapable, He also, of rising to the idea of a *new covenant* thenceforth substituted for the old? He, incapable of doing what had already been done so grandly six centuries before by a simple prophet (Jer. xxxi. 31 et seq.)! And when we think of it, is not Mark's formula (which is probably also the text in Matthew) far from being weaker than that of Paul —is it not even more forcible? If the expression of Mark is translated: "*This is my blood, that of the covenant,*" is not the very name covenant thereby refused to the old? And if it is translated: "*This is the blood of my covenant,*" does not this saying contrast the two covenants with one another as profoundly as is done by the epithet *new* in Paul and Luke?

The nom. abs. τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον, by rendering the idea of the shedding of the blood grammatically independent, serves to bring it more strongly into relief. This appendix, which is wanting in Paul, connects Luke's formula with that of the other two evangelists. Instead of *for you*, the latter say, *for many*. It is the רבים, *many*, of Isa. liii. 12, the גוים רבים of Isa. lii. 15, *those many nations* which are to be sprinkled with the blood of the slain Messiah. Jesus contemplates them in spirit, those myriads of Jewish and Gentile believers who in future ages shall press to the banquet which He is instituting. —Paul here repeats the command: *Do this* . . ., on which rests the permanent celebration of the rite. In this point, too, Luke's formula corresponds more nearly to that of the Syn. than to his.

If there is a passage in respect to which it is morally impossible to assert that the narrators—if they be regarded ever so little as seriously believing—arbitrarily modified the tenor of the sayings of Jesus, it is this. How, then, are we to account for the differences which exist between the four forms? There must have existed from the beginning, in the Judeo-Christian Churches, a generally received liturgical formula for the celebration of the Holy Supper. This is certainly what has been preserved to us by Matthew and Mark. Only, the differences which exist between them prove that they have not used a written document, and that as little has the one copied the other; thus the command of Jesus: "*Drink ye all of it*" (Matthew), which appears in Mark in the form of a positive

fact: "*And they all drank of it;*" thus, again, in Mark, the omission of the appendix: "*for the remission of sins*" (Matthew). We therefore find in them what is substantially one and the same tradition, but slightly modified by oral transmission.—The very different form of Paul and Luke obliges us to seek another original. This source is indicated by Paul himself: "*I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you*" (1 Cor. xi. 23). The expression: *I have received*, admits of no view but that of a communication which is personal to him; and the words: *of the Lord*, only of an immediate revelation from Jesus Himself (a true philologist will not object to the use of ἀπό instead of παρά). If Paul had had no other authority to allege than oral tradition emanating from the apostles, and known universally in the Church, the form used by him: "*I have received* (ἐγὼ γάρ) *of the Lord* that which *also* I delivered unto you . . .," could not be exonerated from the charge of deception. This circumstance, as well as the difference between the two formulæ, decides in favour of the form of Paul and Luke. In the slight differences which exist between them, we can, besides, trace the influence exercised on Luke by the traditional-liturgical form as it has been preserved to us by Matthew and Mark.—As to St. John, the deliberate omission which is imputed to him would have been useless at the time when he wrote; still more in the second century, for the ceremony of the Holy Supper was then celebrated in all the churches of the world. A forger would have taken care not to overthrow the authority of his narrative in the minds of his readers by such an omission.

About the meaning of the Holy Supper, we shall say only a few words. This ceremony seems to us to represent the totality of salvation; the bread, the communication of the life of Christ; the wine, the gift of pardon; in other words, according to Paul's language, sanctification and justification. In instituting the rite, Jesus naturally began with the bread; for the shedding of the blood supposes the breaking of the vessel which contains it, the body. But as in the believer's obtaining of salvation it is by justification that we come into possession of the life of Christ, St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16 et seq., follows the opposite order, and begins with the cup, which represents the first grace which faith lays hold of, that of pardon.—In the act itself there are represented the two aspects of the work—the divine offer, and human acceptance. The side of human acceptance is clear to the consciousness of the partaker. His business is simply, as Paul says, "*to show the Lord's death,*" 1 Cor. xi. 26. It is not so with the divine side; it is unfathomable and mysterious: "*The communion of the blood, and of the body of Christ!*" 1 Cor. x. 16. Here, therefore, we are called to apply the saying: "*The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law,*" Deut. xxix. 29. We know already what we have to do to celebrate a true communion. We may leave to God the secret of what He gives us in a right communion. Is it necessary to go further in search of the formula of union?

3*d*. Vers. 21–23.[1] "*Only, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.* 22. *And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined: But woe unto that man by whom He is betrayed!* 23. *And they began to inquire among themselves which of them it was that should do this thing.*"— As He follows the cup circulating among the disciples, the attention of Jesus is fixed on Judas. In the midst of those hearts, henceforth united by so close a bond, there is one who remains outside of the common salvation, and rushes upon destruction. This contrast wounds the heart of Jesus. Πλήν, *excepting,* announces precisely the exception Judas forms in this circle; ἰδού, *behold,* points to the surprise which so unexpected a disclosure must produce in the disciples. If this form used by Luke is historically trustworthy, there can be no doubt that Judas took part in celebrating the Holy Supper. No doubt the narratives of Matthew and Mark do not favour this view; but they do not expressly contradict it, and we have already shown that the order in which Luke gives the three facts composing the narrative of the feast, is much more natural than theirs. Besides, John's order confirms that of Luke, if, as we think we have demonstrated (*Comment. sur Jean,* t. ii. p. 540 et seq.), the Holy Supper was instituted at the time indicated in xiii. 1, 2. Moreover, John's narrative shows that Jesus returned again and again during the feast to the treachery of Judas. As usual, tradition had combined those sayings uttered on the same subject at different points of time, and it is in this summary form that they have passed into our Syn.—The expression of Matthew: "*dipping the hand into the dish with me,*" signifies in a general way (like that of Luke: "*being with me on the table,*" and the parallels): "being my guest." Jesus does not distress Himself about what is in store for Him; He is not the sport of this traitor; everything, so far as He is concerned, is divinely decreed (ver. 22). His life is not in the hands of a Judas. The Messiah *ought* to die. But He grieves over the crime and lot of him who uses his liberty to betray Him.

The reading ὅτι is less simple than καί, and is hardly compatible with the μέν. The πλήν, *only* (ver. 21), is contrasted with the idea of the divine decree in ὡρισμένον. It serves

[1] Ver. 22. The Mss. are divided between και (T. R.; Byz.) and οτι (Alex.).

the end of reserving the liberty and responsibility of Judas.—The fact that every disciple, on hearing this saying, turned his thoughts upon himself, proves the consummate ability with which Judas had succeeded in concealing his feelings and plans. The *μήτι ἐγώ, Is it I?* of the disciples in Matthew and Mark, finds its natural place here. It has been thought improbable that Judas also put the question (Matt. v. 25). But when all the others were doing it, could he have avoided it without betraying himself? The *thou hast said* of Jesus denotes absolutely the same fact as John xiii. 26: "*And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot.*" This act itself was the reply which Matthew translates into the words: *Thou hast said.*

3. *The Conversations after the Supper:* vers. 24–38.—The conversations which follow refer: 1*st.* To a dispute which arises at this moment between the apostles (vers. 24–30); 2*d.* To the danger which awaits them at the close of this hour of peace (vers. 31–38). The washing of the feet in John corresponds to the first piece. The prediction of St. Peter's denial follows in his Gospel, as it does in Luke. According to Matthew and Mark, it was uttered a little later, after the singing of the hymn. It is quite evident that Luke is not dependent on the other Syn., but that he has sources of his own, the trustworthiness of which appears on comparison with John's narrative.

1*st.* Vers. 24–30.[1] The cause of the dispute, mentioned by Luke only, cannot have been the question of precedence, as Langen thinks. The strife would have broken out sooner. The mention of the kingdom of God, vers. 16 and 18, might have given rise to it; but the *καί, also,* of Luke, suggests another view. By this word he connects the question: *Which is the greatest?* with that which the disciples had just been putting to themselves, ver. 23: *Which among us is he who shall betray Him?* The question which was the worst among them led easily to the other, which was the best of all. The one was the counterpart of the other. Whatever else

[1] Ver. 26. ℵ. B. D. L. T., *γινεσθω* instead of *γενεσθω*.—Ver. 30. 8 Mjj. (Byz.) 80 Mnn. omit *εν τη βασιλεια μου*.—ℵ^c D. X. 20 Mnn. Syr^cur. It^aliq. add *δωδεκα* before *θρονων* (taken from Matthew).—10 Mjj., *καθησεσθε* or *κάθησθε* instead of *καθισεσθε*.

may be true, we see by this new example that Luke does not allow himself to mention a situation at his own hand of which he finds no indication in his documents. The δοκεῖ, *appears* [should be accounted], refers to the judgment of men, till the time when God will settle the question. Comp. a similar dispute, ix. 46 et seq. and parall. We are amazed at a disposition so opposed to humility at such a time. But Jesus is no more irritated than He is discouraged. It is enough for Him to know that He has succeeded in planting in the heart of the apostles a pure principle which will finally carry the day over all forms of sin: "*Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you*," He says to them Himself, John xv. 3. He therefore calmly continues the work which He has begun. In human society, men reign by physical or intellectual force; and εὐεργέτης, *benefactor*, is the flattering title by which men do not blush to honour the harshest tyrants. In the new society which Jesus is instituting, he who has most is not to make his superiority felt in any other way than by the superabundance of his services toward the weakest and the most destitute. The example of Jesus in this respect is to remain as the rule. The term ὁ νεώτερος, *the younger* (ver. 26), is parallel to ὁ διακονῶν, *he that doth serve*, because among the Jews the humblest and hardest labour was committed to the youngest members of the society (Acts v. 6, 10). If the saying of ver. 27 is not referred to the act of the feet-washing related John xiii., we must apply the words: *I am among you as He that serveth*, to the life of Jesus in general, or perhaps to the sacrifice which He is now making of Himself (vers. 19 and 20). But in this way there is no accounting for the antithesis between: "he that *sitteth* at meat," and: "he that *serveth*." These expressions leave no doubt that the fact of the feet-washing was the occasion of this saying. Luke did not know it; and he has confined himself to transmitting the discourse of Jesus as it was furnished to him by his document.

After having thus contrasted the ideal of an altogether new greatness with the so different tendency of the natural heart, Jesus proceeds to satisfy what of truth there was in the aspiration of the disciples (vers. 28–30). The ὑμεῖς δέ, *but ye*, alludes to Judas, who *had* not *persevered*, and who, by his defection, deprived himself of the magnificent privilege pro-

mised vers. 29 and 30. Perhaps the traitor had not yet gone out, and Jesus wished hereby to fall upon his heart.—The *πειρασμοί, temptations,* of which Jesus speaks, are summed up in His rejection by His fellow-citizens. It was no small thing, on the part of the Eleven, to have persevered in their attachment to Jesus, despite the hatred and contempt of which He was the object, and the curses heaped upon Him by those rulers whom they were accustomed to respect. There is something like a feeling of gratitude expressed in the saying of Jesus. Hence the fulness with which He displays the riches of the promised reward. Ver. 29 refers to the approaching dispensation on the earth; ver. 30, to the heavenly future in which it shall issue. *Ἐγώ, I* (ver. 29), is in opposition to *ὑμεῖς, ye:* "That is what *ye* have done for me; this is what *I* do in my turn (*καὶ*) for you." The verb *διατιθέναι, to dispose,* is applied to testamentary dispositions. Bleek takes the object of this verb to be the phrase which follows, *that ye may eat . . .* (ver. 30); but there is too close a correspondence between *appoint* and *hath appointed unto me,* to admit of those two verbs having any but the same object, *βασιλείαν, the kingdom:* "*I appoint unto you the kingdom, as my Father hath appointed it unto me.*" This *kingdom* is here the power exercised by man on man, by means of divine life and divine truth. The truth and life which Jesus possessed shall come to dwell in them, and thereby they shall reign over all, as He Himself has reigned over them. Are not Peter, John, and Paul, at the present day, the rulers of the world? In substance, it is only another form of the thought expressed in John xiii. 20: "*Verily I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me.*" Is this an example of the way in which certain sayings of Jesus are transformed and spiritualized, as it were, in the memory of John, without being altered from their original sense? At least the obscure connection of this saying in John with what precedes is fully explained by Luke's context.

Ver. 30 might apply solely to the part played by the apostles in the government of the primitive Church, and in the moral judgment of Israel then exercised by them. But the expression, *to eat and drink at my table,* passes beyond this meaning. For we cannot apply this expression to the Holy

Supper, which was no special privilege of the apostles. The phrase, *in my kingdom*, should therefore be taken in the same sense as in vers. 16 and 18. With the table where He is now presiding, Jesus contrasts the royal banquet, the emblem of complete joy in the perfected kingdom of God. He likewise contrasts, in the words following, with the judgments which He and His shall soon undergo on the part of Israel, that which Israel shall one day undergo on the part of the Twelve. According to 1 Cor. vi. 1 et seq., the Church shall judge the world, men and angels. In this judgment of the world by the representatives of Jesus Christ, the part allotted to the Twelve shall be Israel.—Judgment here includes government, as so often in the O. T. *Thrones* are the emblem of power, as the table is of joy.—If the traitor was yet present, must not such a promise made to his colleagues have been like the stroke of a dagger to his ambitious heart! Here, as we think, should be placed the final scene which led to his departure (John xiii. 21–27).—It seems to us that the Twelve are not very disadvantageously treated in this discourse of Jesus reported by Luke! A saying entirely similar is found in Matt. xix. 28, in a different context. That of Luke is its own justification.

2*d*. Vers. 31–38. Jesus announces to His disciples, first the moral danger which threatens them (vers. 31–34); then the end of the time of temporal well-being and security which they had enjoyed under His protection (vers. 35–38).

Vers. 31–34.[1] "*And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat.* 32. *But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.* 33, 34."—The warning ver. 31 might be connected with ver. 28: "*Ye are they which have continued with me.*" There would be a contrast: "Here is a temptation in which ye shall not continue." But the mention of Satan's part, in respect of the disciples, seems to be suggested by the abrupt departure of Judas, in

[1] Ver. 31. B. L. T. omit the words ειπεν δε ο κυριος.—Ver. 32. The Mss. are divided between επλειπη and εκλειπη, and between στηριξον and στηρισον.—Ver. 34. Instead of πριν η, ℵ. B. L. T. 4 Mnn. read εως, K. M. X. Π. 15 Mnn. εως ου, D. εως οτου.—ℵ. B. L. T. some Mnn., με απαρνησῃ τριτον instead of απαρνησῃ με τριτον μη

which Satan had played a decisive part (John xiii. 27: "*And after the sop, Satan entered into him*"). The tempter is present; he has gained the mastery of Judas; he threatens the other disciples also; he is preparing to attack Jesus Himself. "*The prince of this world cometh,*" says Jesus in John (xiv. 30). And the danger to each is in proportion to the greater or less amount of alloy which his heart contains. This is the reason why Jesus more directly addresses Peter. By the address: *Simon,* twice repeated, He alludes to his natural character, and puts him on his guard against that presumption which is its dominant characteristic. The ἐξ in ἐξῃτήσατο includes the notion: of getting him drawn out of the hands of God into his own. Wheat is purified by means of the sieve or fan; σινιάζω may apply to either. Satan asks the right of putting the Twelve to the proof; and he takes upon himself, over against God, as formerly in relation to Job, to prove that at bottom the best among the disciples is but a Judas. Jesus by no means says (ver. 32) that his prayer has been refused. Rather it appears from the intercession of Jesus that it has been granted. Jesus only seeks to parry the consequences of the fall which threatens them all, and which shall be especially perilous to Peter. Comp. Matthew and Mark: "*All ye shall be offended because of me this night.*" The faithlessness of which they are about to be guilty, might have absolutely broken the bond formed between them and Him. That of Peter, in particular, might have cast him into the same despair which ruined Judas. But while the enemy was spying out the weak side of the disciples to destroy them, Jesus was watching and praying to parry the blow, or at least to prevent it from being mortal to any of them. Langen explains ἐπιστρέψας in the sense of שׁוּב: "strengthen thy brethren *anew.*" But this meaning of ἐπιστρέφειν is unknown in Greek, and the πότε distinguishes the notion of the participle precisely from that of the principal verb. This saying of Jesus is one of those which lift the curtain which covers the invisible world from our view. Although it has been preserved to us only by Luke, Holtzmann acknowledges its authenticity. He ascribes it to a special tradition. That does not prevent him, however, from deriving this whole account from the common source, the proto-Mark. But vers.

35–38 are also peculiar to Luke, and show clearly that his source was different.

Peter believes in his fidelity more than in the word of Jesus. Jesus then announces to him his approaching fall. The name *Peter* reminds him of the height to which Jesus had raised him. Three crowings of the cock were distinguished; the first between midnight and one o'clock, the second about three, the third between five and six. The third watch (from midnight to three o'clock), embraced between the first two, was also called *ἀλεκτοροφωνία, cock-crow* (Mark xiii. 35). The saying of Jesus in Luke, Matthew, and John would therefore signify: "To-day, before the second watch from nine o'clock to midnight have passed, thou shalt have denied me thrice." But Mark says, certainly in a way at once more detailed and exact: "*Before the cock have crowed twice, thou shalt have denied me thrice.*" That is to say: before the end of the third watch, before three o'clock in the morning. The mention of those two crowings, the first of which should have already been a warning to Peter, perhaps makes the gravity of his sin the more conspicuous.—Matthew and Mark place the prediction of the denial on the way to Gethsemane. But John confirms the account of Luke, who places it in the supper room. We need not refute the opinion of Langen, who thinks that the denial was predicted twice.

Vers. 35–38.[1] "*And He said unto them, When I sent you without purse and scrip and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing.* 36. *Then He said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip. And he that hath no* [sword], *let him sell his garment, and buy one.* 37. *For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And He was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me are coming to an end.* . . . 38."—Till then, the apostles, protected by the favour which Jesus enjoyed with the people, had led a comparatively easy life. But the last conflict between Him and the Jewish authorities was about to break out, and how could the apostles,

[1] Ver. 35. Vers. 35–38 were omitted by Marcion.—Ver. 36. Instead of ειπεν ουν, ℵ° B. L. T. 4 Mnn. Syr. ειπεν δε, ℵ* D. ὁ δε ειπεν.—Instead of πωλησατω, D. πωλησαι, 8 Mjj. (Byz.) 115 Mnn. πωλησει; and instead of αγορασατω, 9 Mjj. (Byz.), the most of the Mnn., αγορασει.—Ver. 37. 9 Mjj. (Alex.) 10 Mnn. omit τι after οτι.—ℵ. B. D. L. Q. T., το instead of τα after και γαρ.

during all the rest of their career, escape the hostile blows? This is the thought which occupies our Lord's mind: He gives it a concrete form in the following figures. In ver. 35 He recalls to mind their first mission (ix. 1 et seq.). We learn on this occasion the favourable issue which had been the result of that first proof of their faith. The historian had told us nothing of it, ix. 6.—The object of μὴ ἔχων is evidently μαχαίραν (not πήραν or βαλαντίον): "*Let him who hath not* [a sword], *buy one.*" It heightens the previous warning. Not only can they no longer reckon on the kind hospitality which they enjoyed during the time of their Master's popularity, and not only must they prepare to be treated henceforth like ordinary travellers, paying their way, etc.; but they shall even meet with open hostility. Disciples of a man treated as a *malefactor*, they shall be themselves regarded as dangerous men; they shall see themselves at war with their fellow-countrymen and the whole world. Comp. John xv. 18–25, the piece of which this is, as it were, the summary and parallel. The sword is here, as in Matt. x. 34, the emblem of avowed hostility. It is clear that in the mind of Him who said: "I send you forth *as lambs* among wolves," this weapon represents the power of holiness in conflict with the sin of the world,—that *sword of the Spirit* spoken of by Paul (Eph. vi. 17).—The καὶ γάρ, *and in truth*, at the end of the verse, announces a second fact analogous to the former (*and*), and which at the same time serves to explain it (*in truth*). The tragical end of the ministry of Jesus *is also approaching*, and consequently no features of the prophetic description can be *slow* in being realized.—The disciples seem to take literally the recommendation of Jesus, and even to be proud of their prudence. The words, *It is enough*, have been understood in this sense: "Let us say no more; let us now break up; events will explain to you my mind, which you do not understand." But is it not more natural to give to ἱκανόν ἐστι this mournfully ironic sense: "Yes, for the use which you shall have to make of arms of this kind, those two swords are enough."—Here we must place the last words of John xiv.: "*Rise; let us go hence.*" The Syn. have preserved only a few hints of the last discourses of Jesus, (John xiv.–xvii.). These were treasures which could not be transmitted to the Church in the

way of oral tradition, and which, assuming hearers already formed in the school of Jesus like the apostles, were not fitted to form the matter of popular evangelization.

III. *Gethsemane:* xxii. 39–46.—The Lamb of God must be distinguished from typical victims by His free acceptance of death as the punishment of sin; and hence there required to be in His life a decisive moment, when, in the fulness of His consciousness and liberty, He *should accept* the punishment which He was to undergo. At Gethsemane Jesus did not drink the cup; He consented to drink it. This point of time corresponds to that in which, with the same fulness and liberty, He refused in the wilderness universal sovereignty. There He rejected dominion over us without God; here He accepts death for God and for us. Each evangelist has some special detail which attests the independence of his sources. Matthew exhibits specially the gradation of the agony and the progress toward acceptance. Mark has preserved to us this saying of primary importance: "*Abba! Father! all things are possible unto Thee.*" Luke describes more specially the extraordinary physical effects of this moral agony. His account is, besides, very much abridged. John omits the whole scene, but not without expressly indicating its place (xviii. 1). In the remarkable piece, xii. 23–28, this evangelist had already unveiled the essence of the struggle which was beginning in the heart of Jesus; and the passage proves sufficiently, in spite of Keim's peremptory assertions, that there is no dogmatic intention in the omission of the agony of Gethsemane. When the facts are sufficiently known, John confines himself to communicating some saying of Jesus which enables us to understand their spirit. Thus it is that chap. iii. sheds light on the ordinance of Baptism, and chap. vi. on that of the Holy Supper.—Heb. v. 7–9 contains a very evident allusion to the account of Gethsemane,—a fact the more remarkable, as that epistle is one of those which, at the same time, most forcibly exhibit the divinity of Jesus.

Vers. 39–46.[1] The word *came out* (ver. 39) includes His

[1] Ver. 39. 6 Mjj. some Mnn. omit αυτου after μαθηται.—Ver. 42. The Mss. are divided between παρενεγκειν (T. R., Byz.), παρενεγκαι (Alex.), and παρενεγκε (B. D. T. 25 Mnn.).—Vers. 43, 44. These two verses, which T. R. reads, with ℵ* etc., D. F. G. H. K. L. M. Q. U. X. Λ, the most of the Mnn. Syr. It. Just. Ir.

leaving the room and the city. The name, *the Mount of Olives*, which is used here by our three Syn., may designate in a wide sense the slope and even the foot of the mount which begins immediately beyond the Cedron. This is the sense to which we are led by John's account, xviii. 1. The north-west angle of the enclosure, which is now pointed out as the garden of Gethsemane, is fifty paces from the bed of the torrent.—Ver 40. Jesus invites His disciples to prepare by prayer for the trial which threatens their fidelity, and of which He has already forewarned them (ver. 31). The use of the word εἰσελθεῖν, *enter into*, to signify *to yield to*, is easily understood, if we contrast this verb in thought with διελθεῖν, *to pass through*.—In Matthew and Mark, Jesus has no sooner arrived than He announces to His disciples His intention to pray Himself. Then, withdrawing a little with Peter, James, and John, He tells them of the agony with which His soul is all at once seized, and leaves them, that He may pray alone. These successive moments are all united in Luke in the ἀπεσπάσθη, *He was withdrawn* (ver. 41). There is in this term, notwithstanding Bleek's opinion, the idea of some violence to which He is subject; He is dragged far from the disciples by anguish (Acts xxi. 1). The expression, to the distance *of about a stone's cast*, is peculiar to Luke.—Instead of *kneeling down*, Matthew says, He fell *upon His face*; Mark, *upon the ground*.—The terms of Jesus' prayer, ver. 42, differ in the three narratives, and in such a way that it is impossible the evangelists could have so modified them at their own hand. But the figure of the *cup* is common to all three; it was indelibly impressed on tradition. This cup which Jesus entreats God to cause to pass from before (παρά) His lips, is the symbol of that terrible punishment the dreadful and mournful picture of which is traced before Him at this moment by a skilful painter with extraordinary vividness. The painter is the same who in the wilderness, using a like illusion, passed before His view the magical scene of the glories belonging to the Messianic kingdom.

Dion. al. Ar. Chrys. Eus., are wanting in ℵ* A., B, R. T. 3 Mnn., Sah. Cyr., in several Greek and Latin Mss. quoted by Hilary, Epiph., Jer. They are marked with signs of doubt in E. S. V. Δ. Π. 5 Mnn.—ℵ. X. some Mnn. Vss., καταβαίνοντος instead of καταβαίνοντες.—Ver. 45. All the Mjj. omit αὐτου after μαθητας.

Mark's formula is distinguished by the invocation, "*Abba! Father! all things are possible unto Thee,*" in which the translation ὁ πατήρ, *Father*, has been added by the evangelist for his Greek readers. It is a last appeal at once to the fatherly love and omnipotence of God. Jesus does not for a moment give up the work of human salvation; He asks only if the cross is really the indispensable means of gaining this end. Cannot God in His unlimited power find another way of reconciliation? Jesus thus required, even He, to obey without understanding, *to walk by faith.* Hence the expressions, Heb. v. 8, *He learned obedience,* and xii. 2, ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως, *He who leads the way* (the initiator) *of faith.* Yet this prayer does not imply the least feeling of revolt; for Jesus is ready to accept the Father's answer, whatever it may be. What if nature rises within Him against this punishment? this repugnance is legitimate. It was not with the view of suffering thus that man received from God a body and a soul. This resistance of natural instinct to the will of the Spirit,—that is to say, to the consciousness of a mission,—is exactly what makes it possible for nature to become a real victim, an offering in earnest. So long as the voice of nature is at one with that of God, it may be asked, *Where is the victim for the burnt-offering?* Sacrifice begins where conflict begins. But, at the same time, the holiness of Jesus emerges pure and even perfected from this struggle. Under the most violent pressure, the will of nature did not for a single moment escape from the law of the Spirit, and ended after a time of struggle in being entirely absorbed in it. Luke, like Mark, gives only the first prayer, and confines himself to indicating the others summarily, while Matthew introduces us more profoundly to the *progressive* steps in the submission of Jesus (ver. 42). How much more really *human* do our Gospels make Jesus than our ordinary dogmatics! It is not thus that the work of invention would have been carried out by a tradition which aimed at deifying Jesus.

The appearance of the angel, ver. 43, is mentioned only by Luke. No doubt this verse is wanting in some Alex. But it is found in 13 Mjj. and in the two oldest translations (*Itala* and *Peschito*), and this particular is cited so early as the second century by Justin and Irenæus. It is not very pro-

bable that it would have been added. It is more so that, under the influence of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, it was omitted on the pretext that it was not found either in Matthew or Mark. Bleek, while fully acknowledging the authenticity of the verse, thinks that this particular was wanting in the primitive Gospel, and that it was introduced by Luke on the faith of a later tradition. Schleiermacher supposes the existence of a poetical writing in which the moral suffering of the Saviour was celebrated, and from which the two verses 43 and 44 were taken. But tradition, poetry, and myths tend rather to glorify their hero than to impair his honour. The difficulty which orthodoxy finds in accounting for such particulars makes it hard to suppose that it was their inventor.—This appearance was not only intended to bring spiritual consolation to Jesus, but physical assistance still more, as in the wilderness. The saying uttered by Him an instant before was no figure of rhetoric: "My soul is exceeding sorrowful *even unto death.*" As when in the wilderness under the pressure of famine, He felt Himself dying. The presence of this heavenly being sends a vivifying breath over Him. A divine refreshing pervades Him, body and soul; and it is thus only that He receives strength to continue to the last the struggle to the physical violence of which He was on the very point of giving way. Ver. 44 shows to what physical prostration Jesus was reduced. This verse is omitted on the one hand, and supported on the other, by the same authorities as the preceding. Is this omission the result of the preceding, or perhaps the consequence of confounding the two καί at the beginning of vers. 44 and 45? In either case, there appears to have been here again omission rather than interpolation.—The intensity of the struggle becomes so great, that it issues in a sort of beginning of physical dissolution. The words, *as it were drops*, express more than a simple comparison between the density of the sweat and that of blood. The words denote that the sweat itself resembled blood. Phenomena of frequent occurrence demonstrate how immediately the blood, the seat of life, is under the empire of moral impressions. Does not a feeling of shame cause the blood to rise to the face? Cases are known in which the blood, violently agitated by grief, ends by penetrating through

the vessels which enclose it, and driven outwards, escapes with the sweat through the transpiratory glands.[1] The reading *καταβαίνοντος*, in ℵ and some documents of the *Itala*, though admitted by Tischendorf, has no internal probability. The participle ought to qualify the principal substantive rather than the complement.—The disciples themselves might easily remark this appearance when Jesus awoke them, for the full moon was lighting up the garden. They might also hear the first words of Jesus' prayer, for they did not fall asleep immediately, but only, as at the transfiguration (ix. 32), when His prayer was prolonged.—Jesus had previously experienced some symptoms precursive of a struggle like to this (xii. 49, 50; John xii. 27). But this time the anguish is such that it is impossible not to recognise the intervention of a supernatural agent. Satan had just invaded the circle of the Twelve by taking possession of the heart of Judas. He was about to sift all the other disciples. Jesus Himself at this time was subjected to his action: "*This is the power of darkness*," says He, ver. 53. In the words which close his account of the temptation (iv. 13), Luke had expressly declared: "He departed from Him *till a favourable season*,"—the return of the tempter at a fixed conjuncture.

Vers. 45 and 46. Luke unites the three awakings in one. Then he seeks to explain this mysterious slumber which masters the disciples, and he does so in the way most favourable to them. The cause was not indifference, but rather the prostration of grief. It is well known that deep grief, especially after a period of long and keen tension, disposes to slumber through sheer exhaustion. Nothing could be more opposed than this explanation to the hostile feelings toward the disciples which are ascribed to Luke, and all the more that this particular is entirely peculiar to him.—Ver. 46. Jesus rises from this struggle *delivered from His fear*, as says the Epistle to the Hebrews; that is to say, in possession of the profound calm which perfect submission gives to the soul. The punishment has not changed its nature, it is true; but the impression which the expectation of the cross produces on Jesus is no longer the same. He has given Himself up wholly; He has done what He Himself proclaimed before

[1] See Langen, pp. 212-214.

passing the Cedron: "*For their sakes I sanctify myself*" (John xvii. 19). The acceptance of the sacrifice enables Him to feel beforehand the rest belonging to the completion of the sacrifice. Henceforth He walks with a firm step to meet that cross the sight of which an instant before made Him stagger.

SECOND CYCLE.—CHAP. XXII. 47–XXIII. 46.

The Passion.

The death of Jesus is not simply, in the eyes of the evangelists, and according to the sayings which they put into His mouth, the historical result of the conflict which arose between Him and the theocratic authorities. What happens to Him is that which has been *determined* (xxii. 22). Thus *it must* be (Matt. xxvi. 54). He Himself sought for a time to struggle against this mysterious necessity by having recourse to that *infinite possibility* which is inseparable from divine liberty (Mark xiv. 36). But the burden has fallen on Him with all its weight, and He is now charged with it. He dies *for the remission of the sins of the world* (Matt. xxvi. 28). The dogmatic system of the apostles contains substantially nothing more. Only it is natural that in the Epistles the divine plan should be more prominent; in the Gospels, the action of the human factors. The two points of view complete one another: God acts by means of history, and history is the realization of the divine thought.

This cycle embraces the accounts of the arrest of Jesus (xxii. 47–53); of His twofold trial, ecclesiastical and civil (ver. 54–xxiii. 25); of His crucifixion (vers. 26–46).

1. *The Arrest of Jesus:* xxii. 47–53.—Three things are included in this piece: 1*st.* The kiss of Judas (vers. 47 and 48); 2*d.* The disciples' attempt at defence (vers. 49–51); 3*d.* The rebuke which Jesus administers to those who come to take Him (vers. 52 and 53).

Vers. 47 and 48.[1] The sign which Judas had arranged with the band had for its object to prevent Jesus from

[1] Ver. 47. 12 Mjj. 15 Mnn. omit δι after ετι.—All the Mjj., αυτους (2, αυτοις) instead of αυτων.—D. E. H. X. 60 Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ add after αυτου, τουτο γαρ σημειον διδωκει αυτοις, ον αν φιλησω, αυτος εστιν (taken from the parallels).

escaping should one of His disciples be seized in His stead. In the choice of the sign in itself, as Langen remarks, there was no refinement of hypocrisy. The kiss was the usual form of salutation, especially between disciples and their master. The object of this salutation is not mentioned by Luke; it was understood. We see from John that the fearless attitude of Jesus, who advanced spontaneously in front of the band, rendered this signal superfluous and almost ridiculous.—The saying of Jesus to Judas, ver. 48, is somewhat differently reproduced in Matthew; it is omitted in Mark. In memory of this kiss, the primitive Church suppressed the ceremony of the brotherly kiss on Good Friday. The sole object of the scene which follows in John (the *I am He* of Jesus, with its consequences) was to prevent a disciple from being arrested at the same time.

Vers. 49–51.[1] The Syn. name neither the disciple who strikes, nor the servant struck. John gives the names of both. So long as the Sanhedrim yet enjoyed its authority, prudence forbade the giving of Peter's name here in the oral narrative. But after his death and the destruction of Jerusalem, John was no longer restrained by the same fears. As to the name of Malchus, it was only preserved in the memory of that disciple who, well known in the house of the high priest, knew the man personally. What are we to think of the author of the fourth Gospel, if these proper names were mere fictions?—According to ver. 49, the disciple who struck acted in the name of *all* (ἰδόντες . . . εἶπον, *shall we smite?*). This particular, peculiar to Luke, extenuates Peter's guilt.—John says, with Luke: "the *right* ear." This minute coincidence shows that the details peculiar to Luke are neither legendary nor the inventions of his own imagination.—The words ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου supply in Luke the place of a long and important answer of Jesus in Matthew. Should this command be applied to the officers: "Let me go to *this man*" (Paulus); or "to *the spot* where this man is"? But this would have required ἐᾶτε με, "let *me* go." Or should we understand it, with De Wette, Riggenbach: "*Leave me yet for a moment*"? The ἕως, *till*, does not lead very naturally to

[1] Marcion omitted this passage.—Ver. 49. ℵ. B. L. T. X. some Mnn. omit αὐτῷ before κυρίε.—Ver. 51. ℵ. B. L. R. T. 2 Mnn. omit αὐτου after ωτιον.

this sense. Besides, the *ἀποκριθείς, answering,* shows that the words of Jesus are connected with the act of the disciple rather than with the arrival of the officers. It is not till ver. 52 that Jesus turns to those who have arrived (*πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους*). Here He is addressing the apostles. The meaning is therefore either, "Let these men (the officers) go *thus far* (the length of seizing me)," or (which is more natural), "*Stop there;* strike no such second blow; this one is quite enough." This act of violence, indeed, not only compromised the safety of Peter, but even the Lord's cause. Jesus was all but hindered thereby from addressing Pilate in the words so important for His defence against the crime with which the Jews charged Him (John xviii. 36): "*My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews.*" Nothing less was needed than the immediate cure of Malchus to restore the moral situation which had been injured by this trespass, and to enable Jesus to express Himself without the risk of being confounded by facts.—This cure is related only by Luke; Meyer therefore relegates it to the domain of myth. But if it had not taken place, it would be impossible to understand how Peter and Jesus Himself had escaped from this complaint.

Vers. 52 and 53.[1] Among those who came out, Luke numbers some of the chief priests. Whatever Meyer and Bleek may say, such men may surely, out of hatred or curiosity, have accompanied the band charged with the arrest. Besides, is not the rebuke which follows addressed rather to rulers than to subordinates? As to the *captains of the temple,* see xxii. 4. As to the *officers,* comp. John vii. 45; Acts v. 22-26. John speaks, besides, of *the cohort,* xviii. 3, 12; this word, especially when accompanied by the term *χιλίαρχος, tribune* (ver. 12), and with the antithesis *τῶν Ἰουδαίων,* can only, in spite of all Bäumlein's objections, designate a detachment of the *Roman cohort;* it was, as Langen remarks, an article of provincial legislation, that no arrest should take place without the intervention of the Romans.—The meaning of the rebuke of Jesus is this: "It was from cowardice that

[1] Ver. 52. ℵ. G. H. R. Δ. 50 Mnn., *προς αυτον* instead of *επ' αυτον.*—The Mss. are divided between *εξελθατε* (T. R., Byz.), *εξηλθατε* (Alex.), and *εξηλθετε.*

you did not arrest me in the full light of day." The other two Syn. carry forward their narrative, like Luke, with a *but;* only this *but* is with them the necessity for the fulfilment of the prophecies, while with Luke it is the harmony between the character of the deed and that of the nocturnal hour. Darkness is favourable to crime; for man needs to be concealed not only from others, but from himself, in order to sin. For this reason, night is the time when Satan puts forth all his power over humanity; it is *his hour.* And hence, adds Jesus, it is also *yours,* for you are his instruments in the work which you are doing; comp. John viii. 44, xiv. 30.—Luke omits the fact of the apostles' flight which is related here by Matthew and Mark. Where is the malevolence which is ascribed to him against the Twelve?—Mark also relates, with great circumstantiality, the case of the young man who fled stripped of the linen cloth in which he was wrapped. As, according to Acts xii., the mother of Mark possessed a house in Jerusalem,—as this house was the place where the Church gathered in times of persecution, and as it was therefore probably situated in a by-place,—it is not impossible that it stood in the vale of Gethsemane, and that this young man was (as has long been supposed) Mark himself, drawn by the noise of the band, and who has thus put his signature as modestly as possible in the corner of the evangelical narrative which he composed.

2. *The Judgment of Jesus:* xxii. 54–xxiii. 25.

1*st. The Ecclesiastical Trial:* vers. 54–71.—This account contains three things: (1) St. Peter's denial (vers. 54–62); (2) The evil treatment practised by the Jews (vers. 63–65); (3) The sentence of death pronounced by the Sanhedrim (vers. 66–71).

Luke places the sitting of the Sanhedrim at which Jesus was condemned in the morning, *when the day dawned* (ver. 66). This morning sitting is also mentioned by Matthew (xxvii. 1, *the morning was come*) and Mark (xv. 1, *straightway in the morning*). But, according to those two evangelists, a previous sitting had taken place at the house of Caiaphas during the night, of which they give a detailed description (Matt. xxvi. 57–66; Mark xiv. 53–64). And this even, according to John, had been preceded by a preparatory sitting

at the house of Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas. John does not *relate* either the second or the third sitting, though he expressly *indicates* the place of the latter by the πρῶτον, xviii. 13, and the notice, xviii. 24. This, then, is the order of events: Immediately on His arrest, between one and three o'clock, Jesus was led to the house of Annas, where a preliminary inquiry took place, intended to extract beforehand some saying which would serve as a text for His condemnation (John xviii. 19–23). This sitting having terminated without any positive result, had not been taken up by tradition, and was omitted by the Syn. But John relates it to complete the view of the trial of Jesus, and with regard to the account of Peter's denial, which he wishes to restore to its true light. During this examination, the members of the Sanhedrim had been called together in haste, in as large numbers as possible, to the house of the high priest. The sitting of this body which followed was that at which Jesus was condemned to death for having declared Himself to be the Son of God. It must have taken place about three o'clock in the morning. Matthew (xxvi. 59 et seq.) and Mark (xiv. 55 et seq.) have minutely described it. John has omitted it as sufficiently known through them. In the morning, at daybreak, the Sanhedrim assembled anew, this time in full muster, and in their official hall near the temple. This is the sitting described by Luke, and briefly indicated, as we have seen, by Matthew and Mark. Two things rendered it necessary: (1) According to a Rabbinical law, no sentence of death passed during the night was valid.[1] To this formal reason there was probably added the circumstance that the sentence had not been passed in the official place. But especially (2) it was necessary to deliberate seriously on the ways and means by which to obtain from the Roman governor the confirmation and execution of their sentence. The whole negotiation with Pilate which follows shows that the thing was far from easy, and betrays on the part of the Jews, as we have seen in our *Comment. sur l'évang. de Jean*, a strategical plan completely

[1] *Sanhedrim* 9. 1. Langen objects that, according to this same passage, the pronouncing of sentence should have been deferred till the second day. But it was easier to elude this second law than the former. It was possible, for graver reasons, to decree urgency.

marked out beforehand. It was no doubt at this morning sitting that the plan was discussed and adopted. Matthew also says, in speaking of this last sitting (xxvii. 1), that they took counsel ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν, *about the way of getting Him put to death.* Then it was that Judas came to restore his money to the Sanhedrim *in the temple* (ἐν τῷ ναῷ, Matt. xxvii. 5).

Bleek admits only two sittings in all,—the one preliminary, which was held at the house of Annas (John), and during which Peter's denial took place; the other official, decisive, in which the whole Sanhedrim took part, related by the Syn., who erroneously connect Peter's denial with it, and which is divided also erroneously by Matthew and Mark into two distinct sittings. Langen, on the contrary, with many commentators, identifies the examination before Annas (John xviii. 13, 19–23) with the nocturnal sitting which is described in detail by Matthew and Mark. Against this explanation there are: 1. The entire difference between the matter of the two sittings: in John, a simple examination without judgment; in Matthew and Mark, the express pronouncing of a capital sentence; 2. Ver. 24 of John, "*Annas sent* Jesus bound to Caiaphas,"—a verse which, whatever may be made of it, implies two sittings, the one at the house of Annas, the other at the house of Caiaphas, in the same night. The opinion of Bleek would be more allowable. But we should be authorized in ascribing to the first two Syn. the serious confusion, and then the false division, which Bleek imputes to them, only if the two sittings of the night and morning could not be sufficiently accounted for. Now, we have just seen that it is quite otherwise. A minute particular which distinguishes them confirms their historical reality; in the night sitting there had been unanimity (Mark xiv. 64). Now, if Luke is not mistaken in declaring, xxiii. 51, that Joseph of Arimathea did not vote with the majority, we must conclude that he was not present at the night sitting at the house of Caiaphas, but that he took part only in that of the morning in the temple, which agrees with the fact that Matthew (xxvii. 1) expressly distinguishes the morning assembly as a plenary court, by the adjective πάντες, *all.* The two sittings are thus really distinct. Luke has mentioned only the last,

that of the morning, perhaps because it was only the sentence pronounced then for the second time which had *legal force*, and which therefore was the only one mentioned by his sources.

(1.) Vers. 54–62.[1] *Peter's Denial.*—The account of the evangelists presents insoluble difficulties, if Annas and Caiaphas dwelt in different houses. Indeed, according to Matthew and Mark, who do not mention the examination before Annas, it is at the house of Caiaphas that the denial must have taken place; while according to John, who does not relate the sitting at the house of Caiaphas, it is at the house of Annas that this scene must have occurred. But is it impossible, or even improbable, that Annas and Caiaphas his son-in-law occupied the sacerdotal palace in common? Annas and Caiaphas, high priests, the one till the year 14, the other from the year 17, were so identified in popular opinion, that Luke (iii. 2) mentions them as exercising one and the same pontificate in common,—the one as titulary high priest, the other as high priest *de facto*. So Acts iv. 6: *Annas the high priest and Caiaphas.*[2] But there is more than a possibility or a probability. There is a fact: in John xviii. 15, the entrance of Peter into the palace where the denial took place is explained on the ground that John was known to the high priest, a title which in this context (vers. 13 and 24) can designate no other than Caiaphas; and yet, according to ver. 12, it is the house of Annas which is in question. How are we to explain this account, if Annas and Caiaphas did not inhabit the same house? There is caution in the way in which Luke expresses himself: "They led Him *into the high priest's house*;" he does not say, to the house of *Caiaphas* (Matthew), or to *the presence*

[1] Ver. 54. 10 Mjj. 30 Mnn. It. Vg. omit αυτον after εισηγαγον.—7 Mjj. 10 Mnn., την οικιαν instead of τον οικον.—Ver. 55. ℵ. B. L. T., περιαψαντων instead of ἁψαντων.—7 Mjj. It^{plerique}, omit αυτων after συγκαθισαντων.—B. L. T. 2 Mnn., μεσος instead of εν μεσῳ.—Ver. 57. 9 Mjj. 40 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit αυτον after ηρνησατο.—Ver. 58. 7 Mjj. 15 Mnn., εφη instead of εἶπεν.—Ver. 60. ℵ. D. It. Vg., τι λεγεις instead of ὁ λεγεις.—All the Mjj. many Mnn. omit ὁ before ἀλεκτωρ.—Ver. 61. ℵ. B. L. T. X. some Mnn. instead of του λογου, τοῦ ῥηματος (taken from Matthew and Mark).—8 Mjj. 25 Mnn. read σημερον before ἀπαρνησῃ.—Ver. 62. 9 Mjj. 50 Mnn. Syr^{cur}. omit ὁ Πετρος after ἐξω.

[2] In this passage, the name High Priest is used in the *general* sense which it has throughout the N. T., and Annas is named at the head of the list as president of the Sanhedrim.

of the high priest (Mark), but to the *sacerdotal palace*, where dwelt the two high priests closely united and related.

A covered gateway (πυλών) led from without into the court where the fire was lighted (αὐλή).—The first denial is related by John in a way to show that it took place *during* the appearance before Annas. Comp. the repetition xviii. 18 and 25, which is indirectly intended to show that the denial was simultaneous with that first sitting. The other two denials being placed by John *after* the sitting, took place consequently between the appearance at the house of Annas and the sitting of the Sanhedrim at the house of Caiaphas.—After his first sin, Peter, humbled, and, as it were, afraid of himself, had withdrawn to the gateway (πυλών, Matthew), or to *the outer court* (προαύλιον, Mark), situated before the gateway. There, though more secluded, he is the object of petty persecution on the part of the porteress who had let him in (Mark), of another female servant (Matthew), of *another* individual (ἕτερος, Luke), of the bystanders in general (εἶπον, *they said*, John). The accusation began probably with the porteress, who knew his intimate connection with John; she betrayed him to another servant; and the latter pointed him out to the domestics. Finally, about an hour later (Luke), a kinsman of Malchus (John) recognises him, and engages him in a conversation. Peter's answer makes him known as a Galilean, and consequently as a disciple of Jesus. And the third denial takes place; the cock crows (Matthew, Luke, John) for the second time (Mark). Then Peter, awaking as from a dream, at the moment when he lifts his head, meets the eye of Jesus (Luke). How could the Lord be there? It was the time when, after the examination before Annas, they were leading Him to the sitting of the Sanhedrim before Caiaphas. He was just crossing the court which divided the two sets of apartments; and this is what John means to express by introducing *here* the remark, xviii. 24: "*Now Annas had sent Him bound to Caiaphas.*"—We can understand the profound effect produced upon the disciple by the sight of his Master *bound*, and the look which He gave him in passing. Mark omits this particular, Peter was not likely to relate it in his preaching. Mark merely says: ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε (the imperfect), *hurrying forth, he wept*, went on weeping without ceasing. The other Gospels

simply use the aor. *he wept.* Then it was that he was preserved from despair and its consequences by the intercession of his Master: "*I have prayed for thee . . .*" The answer to the prayer of Jesus was given partly by this look,—a look of pardon as well as of rebuke, which raised the poor disciple, while breaking his heart with contrition. It was thereby that God sustained his faith, and prevented him from falling into a state similar to that of Judas.

We recognise in the three Syn. accounts the characteristic of traditional narrative in their combining the three denials in a single description; it was the *ἀπομνημόνευμα, the recital,* of the denial. John, as an eye-witness, has given the historical fact its natural divisions. —But notwithstanding their common type, each Syn. account has also its delicate shades and special features, rendering it impossible to derive it from the same written source as the other two. Matthew is the writer who best exhibits the gradation of the three denials (as in Gethsemane that of the three prayers of Jesus).

(2.) Vers. 63–65.[1]—The evil treatment mentioned here is the same as that related by Matthew and Mark, and placed by them after the sitting of the Sanhedrim at the house of Caiaphas. It is the parody of the *prophetic* knowledge of Jesus, the ridicule of the *Jews.* We shall afterwards see the derision of the Gentiles.

(3.) Vers. 66–71.[2] *The Morning Sitting.*—It is impossible to determine to what extent the Sanhedrim required to repeat in their morning sitting what had passed in the night one. But we are justified in allowing that some details of the one were applied to the other by tradition and by our evangelists. There was nothing in itself blasphemous in one calling himself the Christ. This claim, even if it was false, was not an outrage on the honour of God. If the assertions of Jesus regarding His person appeared in the judgment of the Jews to be blasphemy, it was because in His mouth the title *Son of God* always signified something else and something more than

[1] Ver. 63. 7 Mjj. some Mnn. It. Vg., *αὐτον* instead of *τον Ιησουν.*—Ver. 64. ℵ. B. K. L. M. T. Π., *περικαλυψαντες αυτον* instead of *περικ. αυτ. επυκτον αυτ. τ. προσ. και.*—7 Mjj. omit *αυτον* after *επηρωτων.*

[2] Ver. 66. ℵ. B. D. K. T. 25 Mnn. Or., *απηγαγον* instead of *απηγαγον.*— ℵ. B. L. T., *επον* instead of *επε.*—Ver. 68. ℵ. B. L. T. omit *και* after *εαν δε.*— ℵ. B. L. T. omit the words *μοι η απολυσητε.*—Ver. 69. 7 Mjj. It^{plerique}, Vg. add *δε* after *νυν.*

that of *Messiah*, and because the latter was in His lips only a corollary from the former. In proportion to the care with which Jesus in His ministry had avoided making His Messiahship the subject of His public declarations, He had pointedly designated Himself as the *Son of God*. Hence, in the sitting described by Matthew and Mark, the high priest, when putting to Him the question: "Art thou *the Christ?*" takes care to add: "*the Son of God?*" well knowing that the first assertion cannot be the foundation of a capital charge, unless it be again completed and explained as it had always been in the teaching of Jesus by the second. The question of ver. 67, in Luke, was simply, on the part of the high priest, the introduction to the examination (comp. ver. 70). But Jesus, wishing to hasten a decision which He knew to be already taken, boldly and spontaneously passes in His answer beyond the strict contents of the question, and declares Himself not only the Messiah, but at the same time the Son of man sharing the divine glory. The particle εἰ (ver. 67) may be taken interrogatively: "*Art thou the Christ?* Tell us so in that case." But it is more natural to make it directly dependent on εἶπε: "Tell us *if thou art* . . ."—De Wette has criticised the answer here ascribed to Jesus (vers. 67 and 68). The second alternative: *If I ask you*, appears to him out of place in the mouth of an accused person. It is not so. Here is the position, as brought out by the answer of Jesus: "I cannot address you either as judges whom I am seeking to convince, for you are already determined to put no faith in my declarations, nor as disciples whom I am endeavouring to instruct, for you would not enter into a fair discussion with me." Had he not questioned them once and again previously on the origin of John's baptism, and on the meaning of Ps. cx.? And they had steadily maintained a prudent silence! Jesus foresees the same result, if He should now enter into discussion with them.—The last words: ἢ, ἀπολύσητε, *nor let me go*, are perplexing, because, while grammatically connected with the second alternative, they refer in sense to both. Either, with the Alex., they must be rejected, or they must be taken as a climax: "Nor *far less still* will ye let me go."

Ver. 69. Jesus Himself thus furnishes the Jews with the hold which they seek. The name *Son of man*, which He uses

as most directly connected with that of Christ (ver. 67), is qualified by a description implying that He who bears this title participates in the divine state.—Thereby the trial became singularly shortened. There was no occasion searchingly to examine the right of Jesus to the title of Christ. The claim to divine glory contained in this assertion of Jesus is immediately formulated by the tribunal in the title *Son of God.* It only remains to have the blasphemy articulately stated by the culprit Himself. Hence the collective question, ver. 70. —The form: *ye say that I am, thou sayest it,* is not used in Greek; but it is frequently used in Rabbinical language. By such an answer the party accepts, *as His own affirmation,* the whole contents of the question put to Him.—So far, therefore, from this question proving, as is persistently affirmed, that the name *Son of God* is equivalent in the view of the Jews, or in that of Jesus, to the name *Christ,* the evident progress from the question of ver. 67 to that of ver. 70, brought about by the decided answer of Jesus, ver. 69, clearly proves the difference between the two terms. As to the difference between the night sitting and that of the morning, it was not considerable. In the second, the steps were only more summary, and led more quickly to the end. All that was necessary was to ratify officially what had been done during the night. As Keim says, "the Sanhedrim had not to discuss; they had merely to approve and confirm the decision come to overnight."—In the opinion of those who allege that Jesus was crucified on the afternoon of the 15th, and not of the 14th, the arrest of Jesus, and the three judicial sessions which followed, took place in the night between the 14th and 15th, and so on the sabbatic holy day. Is that admissible? Langen remarks that on the 15th Nisan food might be prepared, which was forbidden on a Sabbath (Ex. xii. 16). But there is no proof that this exception extended to other acts of ordinary life (arrests, judgments, punishments, etc.). He seeks, further, to prove that what was forbidden on a sabbatic day was not to *pronounce* a sentence, but merely *to write* and *execute it.* Now, he says, there is no proof that the sentence of Jesus was written; and it was Roman soldiers, not subject to the law, by whom it was executed. These replies are ingenious; but after all, the objection taken from the general

sabbatic character of the 15th Nisan remains in all its force.

2*d. The Civil Judgment:* xxiii. 1–25.—Here we have the description, on the one hand, of the series of manœuvres used by the Jews to obtain from Pilate the execution of the sentence, and on the other, of the series of Pilate's expedients, or counter-manœuvres, to get rid of the case which was forced on him. He knew that it was out of envy that the chiefs among the Jews were delivering Jesus over to him (Matt. xxvii. 18; Mark xv. 10), and he felt repugnance at lending his power to a judicial murder. Besides, he felt a secret fear about Jesus. Comp. John xix. 8, where it is said: "*When Pilate therefore heard that saying* ('He made Himself the Son of God'), *he was the more afraid;*" and the question, ver. 9: *Whence art thou?*—a question which cannot refer to the earthly birthplace of Jesus,—that was already known to him (Luke xxiii. 6),—and which can only signify in the context: From heaven or from earth? The message of his wife (Matt. xxvii. 19) must have contributed to increase the superstitious fears which he felt.

Vers. 1–5.[1] Since Judæa had been reduced to a Roman province, on the deposition of Archelaus, in the year 7 of our era, the Jewish authorities had lost the *jus gladii*, which the Romans always reserved to themselves in the provinces incorporated with the empire. Perhaps, as Langen concludes, with some probability, from John xviii. 30, 31, previous governors had relaxed the rigour of public right on this point, and Pilate was the first who had confined the Jews within their strict legal competency. There is a tradition, quoted in the Talmud, that "forty years before the destruction of the temple (and so about the year 30 of our era), the right of pronouncing capital sentences was taken from Israel" (*Cant.* 24. 2). Thus is explained the procedure of the Jews (ver. 1) who bring Jesus before Pilate. The other motives by which it has been sought to explain it, such as the desire to put the entire responsibility of this death on Pilate (Mosheim), or that of getting Jesus put to death by the Roman and specially cruel punishment of the cross (Chrysostom), or finally, that of not violating the

[1] Ver. 1. All the Mjj., ηγαγον instead of ηγαγεν (T. R.).—Ver. 2. 10 Mjj. 60 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. add ημων after εθνος.—א. B. L. T. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg. add και before λεγοντα.—Ver. 5. א. B. L. T. Syr. add και before αρξαμενος.

quiet of the feast (Augustine), have been refuted by Langen (pp. 246–251).—It cannot be decided with certainty whether Pilate at this time resided in the palace of Herod the Great, on the hill of Sion, or in the citadel Antonia, at the north-west of the temple. Tradition makes the *Via Dolorosa* begin at this latter spot. The complaint uttered by the Jews, ver. 2, was not the actual beginning of this long negotiation. John alone has preserved to us its true commencement (xviii. 29–32). The Jews began very skilfully by trying to get Pilate to execute the sentence without having submitted it for his confirmation. The latter, more adroit than they, and eagerly profiting by the turn thus given to the case, declared to them that he was well pleased not to interfere in the matter, and that he left Jesus in their hands, that is to say, within the limits of their competency (the execution of purely Jewish penalties—excommunication from the synagogue, scourging, etc.). But that did not come up to the reckoning of the Jews, who wished at any price the death of Jesus. They must therefore abandon the exalted position which they had attempted to take, and submit their sentence to be judged by Pilate.

Here begins the second manœuvre, the political accusation (Luke, ver. 2; comp. the three other accounts which are parallel). This charge was a notorious falsehood; for Jesus had resolved in the affirmative the question whether tribute should be paid to Cæsar, and had carefully abstained from everything which could excite a rising of the people. The semblance of truth which is required in every accusation, was solely in the last words: *He made Himself the Christ*, a title which they maliciously explained by that of *king*. They began by giving to the name Christ a political colour in the mouth of Jesus. Hence they conclude that He *was bound* to forbid the payment of tribute. If He did not actually do so, He should have done it logically. Therefore it was as if He had done it; the crime may be justly imputed to Him. This translation of the title *Christ* by that of *king* before Pilate is especially remarkable, if we compare it with the transformation of the same title into that of *Son of God* before the Sanhedrim. The object of the one was to establish the accusation of *rebellion*, as that of the other was to prove the charge of *blasphemy*. There is a versatility in this hatred.—The four narratives agree in the

question which Pilate addresses to Jesus. We know from John that Jesus was in the prætorium, while the Jews took their stand in the open square; Pilate went from them to Him, and from Him to them. The brief answer of Jesus: *Thou sayest it,* is surprising. But it appears from John that the word is only the summary of a conversation of some length between Jesus and Pilate,—a conversation which oral tradition had not preserved. Pilate was intelligent enough to know what to think of the sudden zeal manifested by the Sanhedrim for the Roman dominion in Palestine, and the conversation which he had with Jesus on this first head of accusation (John xviii. 33–38) resulted in convincing him that he had not to do with a rival of Cæsar. He therefore declares to the Jews that their accusation is unfounded. But they insist (ver. 5), and advance as a proof the sort of popular movement of which Galilee was the starting-point (ἀρξάμενος), and which spread quite recently to the very gates of Jerusalem (ἕως ὧδε),—an allusion to the Palm Days. It is to the mention of this new charge that we may apply Matt. xxvii. 12 and Mark xv. 3, 4, where there is indicated a repetition of accusations which Jesus answered only by silence. Luke also declares, ver. 5, *that they were the more fierce.* A second expedient then presents itself to Pilate's mind: to consign the whole matter to Herod, the sovereign of Galilee (vers. 6–12).

Vers. 6–12.[1] Luke alone relates this remarkable circumstance. By this step the clever Roman gained two ends at once. First he got rid of the business which was imposed on him, and then he took the first step toward a reconciliation with Herod (ver. 12). The cause of their quarrel had probably been some conflict of jurisdiction. In that case, was not the best means of soldering up the quarrel to concede to him a right of jurisdiction within the very city of Jerusalem? Herod had come to the capital, like Pilate, on account of the feast; ordinarily he lived in the old castle of the Asmonean kings, on the hill of Zion. Jesus was to him what a skilful

[1] Ver. 6. ℵ. B. L. T. omit Γαλιλαιαν before επηρωτησεν.—Ver. 8. B. D. L. T., εξ ικανων χρονων instead of εξ ικανου (T. R., Byz.) or εξ ικανου χρονου (4 Mjj. Syr. Itplerique).—8 Mjj. some Mun. Syrcur. omit πολλα after ακουειν.—Ver. 11. ℵ.B.L.T. omit αυτον after περιβαλων.—ℵ* L. R., επεμψεν instead of ανεπεμψεν.—Ver. 12. ℵ. B. L. T., αυτους instead of ἑαυτοὺς.

juggler is to a seated court—an object of curiosity. But Jesus did not lend Himself to such a part; He had neither words nor miracles for a man so disposed, in whom, besides, He saw with horror the murderer of John the Baptist. Before this personage, a monstrous mixture of bloody levity and sombre superstition, He maintained a silence which even the accusations of the Sanhedrim (ver. 10) could not lead Him to break. Herod, wounded and humiliated, took vengeance on this conduct by contempt. The expression, *a gorgeous robe* (ver. 11), denotes not a purple garment, but a white mantle, like that worn by Jewish kings and Roman grandees on high occasions.[1] We cannot see in this, with Riggenbach, a contemptuous allusion to the white robe of the high priest. It was a parody of the royal claims of Jesus, but at the same time an indirect declaration of His innocence, at least in a political point of view.—The στρατεύματα, *soldiers* of Herod, can only mean his attendants, his body-guard, who were allowed to accompany him in the capital.

Vers. 13–19.[2] Not having succeeded in this way, Pilate finds himself reduced to seek another expedient. Two present themselves to his mind: first, the offer to chastise Jesus,—that is to say, to scourge Him; then the proposition to release Him as a pardoned malefactor, according to the custom of the feast. The penalty of scourging strictly formed part of the punishment of crucifixion; it was the imperative preliminary. Jerome says (*in Matt.* xxvii.): *Sciendum est Pilatum romanis legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum erat ut qui crucifigeretur, prius flagellis verberetur* (Langen, p. 281). This previous punishment was often mortal.[3] In this case Pilate offered it to the Jews in place of crucifixion, not as the first act of that punishment. He hoped that at the sight of this the more moderate would be satisfied, and that the last act would not

[1] Langen, p. 270, note (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 1. 1; Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 89).

[2] Ver. 14. ℵ. A. L. Δ. some Mnn. omit κατ' before αυτου. — Ver. 15. ℵ. B. K. L. M. T. Π. several Mnn., ανεπεμψεν γαρ αυτον προς ημας instead of ανεπεμψα γαρ υμας προς αυτον, which T. R. reads, with 12 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. It^plerique, Vg. and Syr. (which substitutes αυτον for υμας).—Ver. 17. A. B. K. L. T. Π. a Fuld. Sah. omit this verse. D. Syr^cur. place it after ver. 19.—Ver. 18. ℵ. B. L. T. 2 Mnn., ανεκραγον instead of ανεκραξαν.—Ver. 19. B. L. T., βληθεις instead of βεβλημενος.—ℵ. B. L. T. X., εν τη φυλακη instead of εις φυλακην.

[3] Cicero, *in Flaccum*, § 10.

be demanded of him. But to secure the certainty of this means, he combines it with the other. The time was come for releasing a state prisoner, as was common at the feast. He reckons on the numerous adherents of Jesus who had welcomed Him with acclamations on Palm Day, and whose voices, in spite of the rulers, would make themselves heard in demanding His release.

At ver. 15, Tischendorf prefers the Alex. reading: "For he sent him to us," instead of, "For I sent you to him." But this reading has arisen from an entire misunderstanding of the following phrase. It was translated, "And, lo! nothing is done unto him (at Herod's court) to show that he has been judged worthy of death;" while the Greek expression signifies, according to a well-known construction, "And, lo! he is found to have done nothing (He, Jesus) which was worthy of death [in Herod's conviction as well as in mine]." The received reading is therefore indisputably the true one. — Pilate declares aloud that the result of this whole series of inquiries has been to establish the innocence of Jesus. But why in this case conclude, as he does (*therefore*, ver. 16), by offering to scourge Him, thereafter to release Him? It was already a denial of justice to send Jesus to Herod after having acknowledged His innocence; it is a more flagrant one still to decree against Him, without any alleged reason, the penalty of scourging. This first concession betrays his weakness, and gives him over beforehand to his adversaries, who are more decided than he.—If ver. 17 is authentic, and if it is to be put here (see the critical note), the most natural connection between vers. 16 and 17 is this: "I will release him; for I am even under obligation to release unto you a prisoner." Pilate affects to have no doubt that, when the liberation of a prisoner is offered to the people, they will claim Jesus. But if this verse is rejected as unauthentic, we must recognise in the *ἀπολύσω, I will release*, ver. 16, a positive allusion to the custom of releasing a prisoner. At ver. 18, the Jews, understanding in a moment Pilate's idea, would reply to him by putting themselves at his view-point. But this explanation is somewhat forced, and the omission of ver. 17 may have arisen in the Alex. from confounding the two *AN* . . . which begin the two verses 17 and 18.—In John, Pilate, while

reminding the people of this custom, directly offers them the deliverance of Jesus. This was probably the real course of events. In Matthew, he puts the alternative between Jesus and Barabbas, which is less natural. In Mark, it is the people who, interrupting the deliberation relative to Jesus, all at once claim the liberation of a prisoner, which is less natural still. —The origin of the custom here mentioned is not known. It is far from probable that it was introduced by the Romans. Langen justly quotes against this supposition the words of Pilate (John xviii. 39), "*Ye have* a custom." Perhaps it was a memorial of the great national deliverance, of the escape from Egypt, which was celebrated at the feast of Passover. The Romans, who took a pride in respecting the usages of conquered peoples, had fallen in with this custom.

But before Pilate had carried out the scourging, the people had already made their choice. This choice is presented, ver. 18, as unanimous and spontaneous (παμπληθεί), while Matthew and Mark, more accurate on the point, ascribe it to the pressure exercised by the rulers and their underlings, which harmonizes with John xix. 6.—Mark and Luke characterize Barabbas as one who had been guilty of murder in an insurrection; he was therefore a representative of the same revolutionary spirit of which the Sanhedrim were accusing Jesus. To give up Jesus to the cross, and to demand Barabbas, was to do at the same moment two significant acts. It was to repudiate the spirit of submission and faith which had distinguished the whole work of Jesus, and which might have saved the people. It was at the same time to let loose the spirit of revolt which was to carry them to their destruction. —The name *Barabbas* comes from בר and אבא (*son of the father*). This name signifies, according to most, *son of Abba*, of God. Keim understands son of the Rabbin, taken as spiritual *father*. The name *Jesus*, which is also given to this man in 4 Mnn. of Matthew, and which was found, according to the Fathers, in a considerable number of MSS., was probably added to the name of Barabbas, with the desire to render the parallelism the more striking.

The liberation of Barabbas was a judicial act; to carry it out, Pilate must ascend his judgment-seat. It was probably at this moment that the message of his wife, of which Matthew

speaks (ver. 19, "*When he was set down on the judgment-seat*"), was transmitted to him.

Vers. 20–25.[1] This manœuvre having failed, Pilate returns to the expedient on which he reckons most; he will try to satisfy the anger of the most infuriated, and to excite the pity of those who are yet capable of this feeling, by a beginning of punishment. The real contents of the declaration announced by the προσεφώνησε, *he spake again to them*, ver. 20, are not expressed till the end of ver. 22: "*I will therefore chastise him, and let him go.*" But Pilate is interrupted before having uttered his whole thought by the cries of the Jews, ver. 21; his answer, ver. 22, breathes indignation. By the τρίτον, *for the third time*, allusion is made to his two previous declarations, ver. 4 and vers. 14, 15. Γάρ bears on the idea of crucifixion, ver. 21: "Crucify him? *For he has done . . . what evil?*" But this indignation of Pilate is only an example of cowardice. Why scourge Him whom he acknowledges to be innocent? This first weakness is appreciated and immediately turned to account by the Jews. It is here, in Luke's account, that the scourging should be placed. John, who has left the most vivid recital of this scene, places it exactly at this moment. According to Matthew and Mark, the scourging did not take place till after the sentence was pronounced, agreeably to custom, and as the first stage of crucifixion.—Ver. 23 summarizes a whole series of negotiations, the various phases of which John alone has preserved to us (xix. 1–12). Jesus, covered with blood, appears before the people. But the rulers and their partisans succeed in extinguishing the voice of pity in the multitude. Pilate, who reckoned on the effect of the spectacle, is shocked at this excess of cruelty. He authorizes them to carry out the crucifixion themselves at their own risk; they decline. They understand that it is he who serves as their executioner. To gain him there remain yet two ways. All at once changing their tactics, they demand the death of Jesus as a blasphemer: "*He made himself the Son of God.*" But on hearing this accusation, Pilate shows

[1] Ver. 20. 6 Mjj. 2 Mnn. Vss., δε instead of ουν.—א. B. L. T. 2 Mnn. add αυτοις after προσεφωνησεν.—Ver. 21. א. B. D. F[a] Or., σταυρου, σταυρου, instead of σταυρωσον, σταυρωσον.—Ver. 23. א. B. L. 130 Mnn. It[plerique], omit και των αρχιερεων after αυτων.—Ver. 25. 16 Mjj. many Mnn. omit αυτοις after απελυσεν δε.

himself still less disposed to condemn Jesus, whose person had already inspired him with a mysterious fear. The Jews then determine to employ the weapon which they had kept to the last, probably as the most ignoble in their own eyes, that of personal intimidation. They threaten him with an accusation before the emperor, as having taken a rebel under his protection. Pilate knows how ready Tiberius will be to welcome such a charge. On hearing this threat, he understands at once, that if he wishes to save his place and life, he has no alternative but to yield. It is at this point that the four narratives again unite. Pilate for the second time ascends the judgment-seat, which was set up in a raised place in the open square situated before the prætorium. He washes his hands (Matthew), and again declining all participation in the judicial murder which is about to be committed, he delivers Jesus over to His enemies.

Ver. 25 of Luke is the only passage of this narrative where the feelings of the historian break through the objectivity of the narrative. The details *repeated* here (ver. 19) regarding the character of Barabbas bring into prominence all that is odious in the choice of Israel; and the words, *he delivered Him to their will*, all the cowardice of the judge who thus declines to act as the protector of innocence. Matthew and Mark here narrate the abuse which Jesus had to suffer from the Roman soldiers; it is the scene related John xix. 1–3, and which should be placed before the scourging. The scene of it, according to Mark, was the inner court of the prætorium, which agrees with John. It was less the mockery of Jesus Himself than of the Jewish Messiah in His person.

3. *The Crucifixion of Jesus:* xxiii. 26–46.—John indicates, as the time when Pilate pronounced sentence, the *sixth hour;* Mark, as the hour at which Jesus was crucified, the *third.* According to the ordinary mode of reckoning time among the ancients (starting from six o'clock in the morning), it would be mid-day with the first, nine o'clock in the morning with the second. The contradiction seems flagrant: Jesus *condemned* at noon, according to John, and *crucified* at nine. according to Mark! Langen brings new arguments to support an attempt at harmony which has often been made—that John reckoned the hours as we do, that is to say, starting

from midnight. The sixth hour would then be with him six o'clock in the morning, which would harmonize a little better with Mark's date, the interval between six and nine o'clock being employed in preparations for the crucifixion.[1]—But is it probable that John adopted a mode of reckoning different from that which was generally in use, and that without in the least apprizing his readers?[2] We incline rather to hold with Lange, in his *Life of Jesus*, that Mark dated the beginning of the punishment from the time of the scourging, which legally formed its first act. In this Mark followed an opinion which naturally arose from the connection in which scourging was ordinarily practised. It is John who, by his more exact knowledge of the whole course of the trial, has placed this part of the punishment of Jesus at its true time and in its true light. The scourging, in Pilate's view, was not the beginning of the crucifixion, but rather a means of preventing it. Thus it is that Mark has ante-dated the crucifixion by the whole interval which divided the scene of the *Ecce homo* from the pronouncing of the sentence and its execution.—It is absolutely impossible to suppose that the whole long and complicated negotiation between the Jews and Pilate took place between the last sitting of the Sanhedrim (which was held *as soon as it was day*, Luke xxii. 66) and six o'clock in the morning. See my *Comment. sur Jean*, ii. pp. 606 and 607.

The punishment of crucifixion was in use among several

[1] Langen rests his argument on three passages, one from the *Natural History* of Pliny the elder (ii. 70), the second from the *Letters* of Pliny the younger (iii. 5), the third from the *Acts* of Polycarp's martyrdom (c. 7), proving that at the beginning of the Christian era our present mode of reckoning (starting from midnight and mid-day) was already known. The third passage really possesses great force; and it is the more important, because it proceeds from the very country in which John wrote.

[2] We owe to M. André Cherbuliez, of Geneva, and M. de Rougemont, who sent it to us, an interesting contribution on this question, taken from the *Sacred Discourses* of Ælius Aristides, a Greek sophist of the second century, a contemporary of Polycarp, whom he may have met in the streets of Smyrna. In the first book, God commands him in a dream to take a cold bath; it is winter; and as the most suitable hour he chooses the sixth, undoubtedly because it is the warmest. Then, addressing his friend Bassus, who keeps him waiting, he says to him, pointing to the pillars, "Seest thou? the shadow is already turning." There is no doubt, therefore, that the sixth hour with him denotes mid-day, and not six o'clock morning or evening.

ancient peoples (Persians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Indians, Scythians, Greeks). Among the Romans, it was used only for slaves (*servile supplicium*, Horace), and for the greatest criminals (assassins, brigands, rebels). It was abolished by Constantine. The scourging took place either before setting out, or on the way to the cross (Liv. xxxiii. 36). According to Plutarch,[1] every criminal carried his own cross. There was borne before him or hung round his neck a white plate, on which his crime was indicated (*titulus*, σανίς, αἰτία). The punishment took place, as a rule, beyond inhabited houses,[2] near a road, that the largest possible number of people might witness it. The Talmud of Jerusalem relates that before crucifixion there was offered to the prisoner a stupifying draught, which compassionate people, generally ladies of Jerusalem, prepared at their own cost.[3] The cross consisted of two pieces, the one perpendicular (*staticulum*), the other horizontal (*antenna*). Nearly at the middle of the first was fixed a pin of wood or horn (πῆμα,[4] *sedile*), on which the prisoner rested as on horseback.[5] Otherwise the weight would have torn the hands, and left the body to fall. They began ordinarily by setting up and fixing the cross (Cic. *Verr.* v. 66; Jos. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 4); then by means of cords the body was raised to the height of *the antenna*, and the nails driven into the hands. The condemned person was rarely nailed to the cross while it was yet lying on the ground, to be afterwards raised.—The cross does not seem to have been very high. Langen thinks that it was twice the height of a man; that is the maximum; and it is probable that generally it was not so high. The rod of hyssop on which the sponge was held out to Jesus could not be more than two or three feet in length. As to the feet, Paulus, Lücke, Winer, and others have more or less positively denied that they were nailed. They appeal to John xx. 25. But would it not have been singular pedantry on the part of Thomas to speak here

[1] *De serâ Numinis vindictâ*, c. 9.

[2] Plautus, *Miles gloriosus*, ii. 4. 6: *extra portam.*

[3] *Bab. Sanh.* f. 43. 1: "A grain of frankincense in a cup of wine; *ut turbaretur ejus intellectus.*"

[4] Ir. *Adv. Hær.* ii. 42.

[5] Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 91: ἐφ' ᾧ ἱπποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρώμενοι. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* ii. 42. Tertullian, *Cont. Marc.* iii. 18.

of the holes *in the feet?* He enumerates the wounds, which were immediately within reach of his hand. It is the same when Jesus speaks to Thomas, ver. 27. Then they allege the fact that the Empress Helena, after having discovered the true cross, sent to her son the nails which had been fastened in the *hands* of Christ.[1] But it is not said that she sent to him all that she had found. The contrary rather appears from the tenor of the narrative (see Meyer, *ad Matt.* xxvii. 35). Hug, Meyer, Langen have proved beyond doubt, by a series of quotations from Xenophon, Plautus, Lucian, Justin, Tertullian, etc., that the custom was to nail the feet also; and Luke xxiv. 39 (written without the least reference to the prophecy of Ps. xxii.) admits of no doubt that this practice was followed in the case of Jesus. For how could His feet have served as a proof of His identity (ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγώ) otherwise than by the wounds the mark of which they bore?—The small board (*suppedaneum*), on which the representations of the crucifixion usually make the feet of our Lord rest, is a later invention, rendered in a way necessary by the suppression of the *sedile* in those pictures. The feet were nailed either the one above the other by means of a single nail, which would explain the epithet τρίσηλος, *three-nailed,* given to the cross by Nonnus, in his versified paraphrase of John's Gospel (4th century), or the one beside the other, which generally demanded four nails in all, as Plautus[2] seems to say, but might also be executed with three, if we suppose the use of a nail in the form of a horse-shoe having two points. Was the sole of the foot supported on the wood by means of a very full bend of the knee, or was the leg in its whole length laid to the cross, so that the feet preserved their natural position? Such details probably varied at the caprice of the executioner. — The crucified usually lived twelve hours, sometimes even till the second or third day. The fever which soon set in produced a burning thirst. The increasing inflammation of the wounds in the back, hands, and feet; the congestion of the blood in the head, lungs, and heart; the swelling of every vein, an indescribable oppression, racking pains in the head; the stiffness of the limbs, caused by the unnatural position of the body;—these all united to make the punishment, in the lan-

[1] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 17. [2] *Mostell.* 2. 1. 13.

guage of Cicero (*in Verr.* v. 64), *crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium.*

From the beginning, Jesus had foreseen that such would be the end of His life. He had announced it to Nicodemus (John iii. 14), to the Jews (xii. 32), and once and again to His disciples. It was the foresight of this which had caused His agony in Gethsemane. No kind of death was so fitted to strike the imagination. For this very reason, no other was so well fitted to realize the end which God proposed in the death of Christ. The object was, as St. Paul says (Rom. iii.), to give to the sinful world a complete demonstration (ἔνδειξις) of the righteousness of God (vers. 25, 26). By its cruelty, a death of this sort corresponds to the odiousness of sin; by its duration, it leaves the crucified one time to recognise fully the right of God; lastly, its dramatic character produces an impression, never to be effaced, on the conscience of the spectator. —Of all known punishments, it was the cross which *must be* that of the Lamb of God.

We divide this piece into three parts: the way to the cross (vers. 26–32); the crucifixion (vers. 33–38); the time passed on the cross (39–46).

1*st.* Vers. 26–32.[1] The punishment required to be inflicted outside the city (Lev. xxiv. 14); it was the type of exclusion from human society (Heb. xiii.). John xix. 17 informs us that Jesus went out of the city bearing His cross Himself, according to custom (Matt. x. 38). But we are left in ignorance of the motive which soon led the Roman soldiers charged with the execution to lay hold of Simon of Cyrene for this office. Did Jesus faint under the burden, or did Simon testify his sympathy with Him rather too loudly; or was there here one of those abuses of military power which are readily indulged in the case of a foreigner? We cannot tell. *Cyrene*, the capital of Libya, had a numerous Jewish population, many of whom came to settle at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 9). It is natural to conclude from the words, *coming out of the country*,

[1] Ver. 26. ℵ. B. C. D. L. X. some Mnn., Σιμωνα τινα κυρηναιον ερχομενον instead of Σιμωνος τινος κυρηναιου ερχομενου.—Ver. 27. A. B. C. D. L. X. some Mnn. omit και after αι. ℵ. omits αι και.—Ver. 29. ℵ. B. C.[1] L. εθρεψαν, D. εξεθρεψαν, instead of εθηλασαν.—Ver. 31. D. K. A. several Mnn. It[plerique] Vg., γενησεται instead of γενηται.

that he was returning to the city after his work. It was not therefore a holy day. Langen answers, it is true, that he might merely have been taking a walk! Mark xv. 21 proves that this event became a bond of union between Simon and the Saviour, and that he soon entered into the Church with his family. He afterwards settled at Rome with his wife and two sons (Rom. xvi. 13).

Vers. 27–32 are peculiar to Luke. In ver. 27 we see popular feeling breaking out through the mouth of the women, not, as M. de Pressensé thinks, those who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee, but inhabitants of Jerusalem.—The sayings of Jesus testify to His entire self-forgetfulness; they contain an allusion to Hos. x. 8. The meaning of ver. 31 appears to be that indicated by Bleek: the green wood is Jesus led to death as a rebel, notwithstanding His constant submission to the Gentile authorities; the dry wood is the Jewish people, who, by their spirit of revolt, will, with much stronger reason, bring down on themselves the sword of the Romans. The more contrary to nature it is that Jesus should die as a rebel, the more is it in keeping with the nature of things that Israel should perish for rebellion. Thus Jesus makes the people aware of the falsehood which ruled His condemnation, and the way in which God will take vengeance. No doubt, behind the human judgment which visits the nation, there is found, as in all similar sayings (comp. Luke iii. 9, etc.), the divine judgment reserved for each individual. This last reference is demanded by the connection of vers. 30 and 31.[1] The figure of the green wood and the dry is borrowed from Ezek. xxi. 3–8.—The two malefactors were probably companions of Barabbas. This accumulation of infamy on Jesus was owing perhaps to the hatred of the rulers. God brought out of it the glory of His Son.

2*d*. Vers. 33–38.[2] Is the spot where Jesus was crucified that which is shown for it at the present day in the enclosure

[1] The Dutch philologist Peerlkaamp (in his *Taciti Agricola*, Leyden 1864) thinks that we must transpose ver. 31, putting it after ver. 27: "And they lamented Him, saying: If they do these things, etc." But this arbitrary transposition is not demanded by anything in the text.

[2] Ver. 33. 5 Mjj. 5 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., ἦλθον instead of ἀπῆλθον.—Ver. 34. ℵ[a] B. D. 2 Mnn. It[alq]. omit the words ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς . . . ποιοῦσιν. These words are found in 20 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr. It[plerique], Ir. Hom. Clement, Acta Pilati, etc.

of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre? The question does not seem yet decided. Though this place is now within the city enclosure, it might not have been so then.—The name *place of the skull* (skull, in Hebrew גלגלת, in Aramaic גלגלתא,[1] from גלל, *to roll*) does not come from the skulls of the condemned which remained lying there; this would require the plural: the place *of skulls;* besides, unburied bones would not have been left there. The name is rather to be traced to the bare rounded form of the hill.—Matthew and Mark relate here that Jesus refused the stupifying draught which was offered Him. According to Mark, it was aromatic wine; according to Matthew, vinegar mingled with gall.[2]

Of the seven sayings which Jesus uttered on the cross, the first three refer to the persons surrounding Him—His enemies, His companion in punishment, and those whom He loves most tenderly, His mother and His friend; they are, as it were, His will. The three which follow: "*My God, my God, . . .; I thirst; it is finished,*" refer to His sufferings and the work which is being finished; the first two, to the sufferings of His soul and of His body; the third, to the result gained by this complete sacrifice. Finally, the seventh and last: "*Father, into Thy hands . . .,*" is the cry of perfect confidence from His expiring heart in its utmost weakness. Three of those seven sayings, all three words of grace and faith, are related by Luke, and by him only.

The prayer of ver. 34 is wanting in some MSS. This omission is probably the result of accident; for the oldest translations, as well as the great majority of MSS., guarantee its authenticity; and the appeal of the thief for the grace of Jesus, a few moments later, cannot be well explained, except by the impression produced on him by the hearing of this

—A. X. several Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg., κληρους instead of κληρον (which seems to be taken from the parallels of the LXX.).—Ver. 35. 7 Mjj. 6 Mnn. Vss. omit συν αυτοις after οι αρχοντες.—Ver. 36. ℵ. B. L., ενεπαιξαν instead of ενεπαιξον.—ℵ. A. B. C. L. omit και before οξος.—Ver. 38. ℵ. B. L. omit γεγραμμενη.—ℵ^{ca} B. C. L. Syr$^{cur.}$ omit the words γραμμασιν ελληνικοις και ρωμαικοις και εβραικοις (taken from John).

[1] It is from this word that the name Golgotha is generally derived (Matthew, Mark, John). Kraft (*Topogr. Jesus.* p. 158) has recently proposed another etymology: גל, *hill*, and גועת, *death* (comp. the place named Jer. xxxi. 39).

[2] The ancient naturalists, Dioscorides and Galen, ascribe to incense and myrrh a stupifying influence (Langen, p. 302).

filial invocation.—The persons for whom this prayer is offered cannot be the Roman soldiers, who are blindly executing the orders which they have received; it is certainly the Jews, who, by rejecting and slaying their Messiah, are smiting themselves with a mortal blow (John ii. 19). It is therefore literally true, that in acting thus *they know not what they do.* The prayer of Jesus was granted in the forty years' respite during which they were permitted, before perishing, to hear the apostolic preaching. The wrath of God might have been discharged upon them at the very moment.

The casting of the lot for the garments of Jesus (ver. 34) belongs to the same class of derisive actions as those related ver. 35 et seq. By this act the prisoner became the sport of his executioners. The garment of the *cruciarii* belonged to them, according to the Roman law. Every cross was kept by a detachment of four soldiers, a τετράδιον (Acts xii. 4). The plural κλήρους, *lots,* is taken from the parallels. The lot was twice drawn, first for the division of the four nearly equal parts into which the garments of Jesus were divided (cloak, cap, girdle, sandals), then for His robe or tunic, which was too valuable to be put into one of the four lots.—The word θεωρεῖν, *beholding* (ver. 35), does not seem to indicate a malevolent feeling; it rather forms a contrast with what follows. The words σὺν αὐτοῖς, *with them,* must be rejected from the text. The meaning of the term, *the chosen of God,* is, that the Christ is He on whose election rests that of the entire people. —The mockeries of the soldiers apply to Jewish royalty in itself, more than to Jesus personally (John xix. 5, 14, 15). It has often been thought that the wine which the soldiers offered to Jesus was that which had been prepared for themselves (ὄξος, a common wine); but the sponge and the rod of hyssop which are on the spot leave no doubt that it was intended to allay the sufferings of the prisoners. It was perhaps the same draught which had been offered to them at the beginning of the crucifixion. The soldiers pretend to treat Jesus as a king, to whom the festive cup is presented. Thus this derisive homage is connected with the ironical inscription (not in regard to Jesus, but in regard to the people) placed on the cross (ver. 38). It is this connection of ideas which is expressed by the ἦν δὲ καί, *there also was.*

By this inscription, so humbling to the Jews, Pilate took vengeance for the degrading constraint to which they had subjected him by forcing him to execute an innocent man. The mention of the three languages is an interpolation taken from John.

3d. Vers. 39–46.[1] Matthew and Mark ascribe the same jestings to the *two* thieves. The partisans of harmony at any price think that they both began with blasphemy, and that one of them afterwards came to himself. In any case, it must be assumed that Matthew and Mark did not know this change of mind; otherwise, why should they not have mentioned it? But is it not more natural to hold that they group in categories, and that they are ignorant of the particular fact related by Luke? How had this thief been touched and convinced? Undoubtedly he had been struck all at once with the contrast between the holiness which shone in Jesus and of his own crimes (vers. 40 and 41). Then the meekness with which Jesus let Himself be led to punishment, and especially His prayer for His executioners, had taken hold of his conscience and heart. The title *Father*, which Jesus gave to God at the very moment when God was treating Him in so cruel a manner, had revealed in Him a Being who was living in an intimate relation to Jehovah, and led him to feel His divine greatness. His faith in the title King of the Jews, inscribed on His cross, was only the consequence of such impressions. The words *οὐδὲ σύ, not even thou* (ver. 40), which he addresses to his companion, allude to the difference of moral situation which belongs to them both, and the railers with whom he is joining: "Thou who art not merely, like them, a spectator of this punishment, but who art undergoing it thyself." It is not for him, who is on the eve of appearing

[1] Ver. 39. B. L. *ουχι*, ℵ. C. Syr$^{cur.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ *λεγων ουχι*, instead of *λεγων σι*.—Ver. 40. ℵ. B. C. L. X., *επιτιμων αυτω εφη* instead of *επιτιμα αυτω λεγων*.—Ver. 42. ℵ. B. C. L., *Ιησου* (vocative) instead of *τω Ιησου*.—ℵ. B. C. D. L. M. 3 Mnn. omit *κυριε*.—B. L. It$^{aliq.}$, *εις την βασιλειαν σου* instead of *εν τη βασιλεια σου*.—Ver. 44. B. C. L. add *ηδη* before *ωσει*.—Ver. 45. ℵ. B. C. (?) L., *του ηλιου εκλιποντος* instead of *και εσκοτισθη ο ηλιος*, which T. R. reads, with 17 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}.—ℵ. B. C. L., *εσχισθη δε* instead of *και εσχισθη*.—Ver. 46. ℵ. A. B. C. K. M. P. Q. U. X. Π. 20 Mnn. Just. Or., *παρατιθεμαι* instead of *παραθησομαι*, which T. R. reads, with 8 Mjj. several Mnn.—ℵ. B. C. D., *τουτο δε* instead of *και ταυτα*, which T. R. reads, with 12 Mjj., or *και τουτο*, which K. M. P. Π. 10 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ read.

before the divine tribunal, to act as the profane. *Ὅτι, because,* refers to the idea contained in *φοβῇ*: "Thou at least oughtest to fear . . .; *for* . . ."

The prayer which he addresses to Jesus (ver. 42) is suggested to him by that faith in an unlimited mercy which had been awaked in him by hearing the prayer of Jesus for His executioners. It seems to me probable that the omission of the word *Κύριε, Lord,* in the Alex., arises from the mistake of the copyist, who was giving the prayer of the thief from memory, and that the transformation of the dative *τῷ Ἰησοῦ* into the apostrophe (*Ἰησοῦ*) was the effect of this omission. The touching cry, *Remember me!* finds its explanation in that community of suffering which seems to him henceforth to establish an indissoluble bond between Jesus and him. Jesus cannot forget him who shared His punishment. The expression, *coming in His kingdom, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ* (not *for* His kingdom, *εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν*), denotes His Messianic return with divine splendour and royal majesty some time after His death. He does not think of the possibility of the *body* of Jesus being raised.—In our Lord's answer, the word *to-day* stands foremost, because Jesus wishes to contrast the nearness of the promised happiness with the remote future to which the prayer of the thief refers. *To-day,* before the setting of the sun which is shining on us. The word *paradise* seems to come from a Persian word signifying *park.* It is used in the form of פרדס (Eccles. ii. 5; Song of Solomon iv. 13), to denote a royal garden. In the form *παράδεισος*, it corresponds in the LXX. to the word גן, *garden* (Gen. ii. 8, iii. 1). The earthly Eden once lost, this word *paradise* is applied to that part of Hades where the faithful are assembled; and even in the last writings of the N. T., the Epistles and the Apocalypse, to a yet higher abode, that of the Lord and glorified believers, the third heaven, 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7. It is paradise as part of Hades which is spoken of here.

The extraordinary signs which accompanied the death of Jesus (vers. 44, 45)—the darkness, the rending of the veil of the temple, and according to Matthew, the earthquake and the opening of several graves, are explained by the profound connection existing, on the one side between Christ and humanity, on the other between humanity and nature. Christ

is the soul of humanity, as humanity is the soul of the external world. We need not take the words, *over all the earth*, in an absolute sense. Comp. xxi. 23, where the expression ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, a weaker one it is true, evidently refers to the Holy Land only. The phenomenon in question here may and must have extended to the surrounding countries. The cause of this loss of light cannot have been an eclipse; for this phenomenon is impossible at the time of full moon. It was perhaps connected with the earthquake with which it was accompanied; or it may have resulted from an atmospheric or cosmical cause.[1] This diminution of the external light corresponded to the moral darkness which was felt by the heart of Jesus: *My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?* This moment, to which St. Paul alludes (Gal. iii. 13: "*He was made a curse for us*"), was that at which the Paschal lamb was slain in the temple.—It is difficult to decide between the two readings, ver. 45: "And the sun was darkened" (T. R.); "And the sun failing." In any case, it is the cause of the phenomenon related ver. 44, mentioned too late. Luke omits the earthquake; he had other sources.

The rending of the veil, mentioned by the three Syn., should probably be connected with this physical commotion. Is the veil referred to that which was at the entrance of the Holy Place, or that which concealed the Holy of Holies? As the second only had a typical sense, and alone bore, strictly speaking, the name καταπέτασμα (Philo calls the other κάλυμμα[2]), it is more natural to think of the latter.

[1] Neander cites the fact (*Leben Jesu*, p. 640) that Phlegon, author of a chronicle under the Emperor Adrian, speaks of an eclipse (?) of the sun as having taken place in the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad (785 A.U.C.), greater than all former eclipses, and that night came on at the sixth hour of the day, to such a degree that the stars were seen shining in the heavens. This date approximates to the probable year of the death of Jesus (783).—M. Liais, a well-known naturalist, relates that on the 11th April 1860, in the province of Pernambuco, while the sky was perfectly clear, the sun became suddenly dark about mid-day to such a degree, that for some seconds it was possible to look at it. The solar disc appeared surrounded with a ring having the colours of the rainbow, and quite near it there was seen a bright star, which must have been Venus. The phenomenon lasted for some minutes. M. Liais attributes it to cosmical nebulæ floating in space beyond our atmosphere. A similar phenomenon must have occurred in the years 1106, 1208, 1547, and 1706 (*Revue germanique*, 1860).

[2] Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 640.

The idea usually found in this symbolic event is this: The way to the throne of grace is henceforth open to all. But did not God rather mean to show thereby, that from that time the temple was no longer His dwelling-place? As the high priest rent his garment in view of any great offence, so God rends the veil which covers the place where He enters into communion with His people; that is to say, the Holy of Holies is no more; and if there is no Holy of Holies, then no Holy Place, and consequently no court, no altar, no valid sacrifices. The temple is profaned, and consequently abolished by God Himself. The efficacy of sacrifice has henceforth passed to another blood, another altar, another priesthood. This is what Jesus had announced to the Jews in this form: Put me to death, and by the very deed ye shall destroy the temple!—Jewish and Christian tradition has preserved the memory of analogous events which must have happened at this period. In the Judeo-Christian Gospel quoted by Jerome (*in Matt.* xxvii. 51), it was related that at the time of the earthquake a large beam lying above the gate of the temple snapped asunder. The Talmud says that forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the gates of the temple opened of their own accord. Johanan Ben Zacchai (יוחנן is חנן, *Anna*, with the name of *Jehovah* prefixed) rebuked them, and said: Temple, wherefore dost thou open of thyself? I see thereby that the end is near; for it is written (Zech. xi. 1), "Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars."[1] —At the time of the eclipse mentioned above, a great earthquake destroyed part of the city of Nice, in Bithynia.[2] This catastrophe may have been felt even in Palestine.—Those phenomena, which are placed by Luke before the time of our Lord's death, are placed by Matthew and Mark immediately after. Another proof of the difference of their sources.

Here should come the two sayings mentioned by John: *I thirst*, and: *It is finished.* Perhaps the words: *When He had cried with a loud voice* (ver. 46), include the saying, *It is finished*, which immediately preceded the last breath. But the participle φωνήσας has probably no other meaning than the verb εἶπε: "Raising His voice, He said." The words: *When He had cried with a loud voice*, in Matthew and Mark,

[1] *Bab. Toma*, 39. 2.

[2] See Neander's *Leben Jesu*, p. 640.

refer rather to the last saying uttered by Jesus according to Luke: *Father, into thy hands* . . . The latter expresses what John has described in the form of an act: *He gave up His spirit.*—The last saying is a quotation from Ps. xxxi. The fut. παραθήσομαι, *I shall commit,* in the received reading, is probably borrowed from the LXX. The fut. was natural in David's mouth, for death was yet at a distance; he described the way in which he hoped one day to draw his last breath. But the present is alone in keeping with the actual circumstances of Jesus. At the moment when He is about to lose self-consciousness, and when the possession of His spirit escapes from Him, He confides it as a deposit to his Father. The word *Father* shows that His soul has recovered full serenity. Not long ago He was struggling with the divine sovereignty and holiness (*my God, my God!*). Now the darkness is gone; He has recovered His light, His Father's face. It is the first effect of the completion of redemption, the glorious prelude of the resurrection.

Keim does not accept as historical any of the seven sayings which Jesus is said to have uttered on the cross. The prayer for his executioners has no meaning either in regard to the Gentile soldiers, who were merely blind instruments, or in respect of the Jews, to whom He had just announced divine judgment. Besides, silence suits Jesus better than a forced and superhuman heroism. The story of the thief is exploded by the fact, that it was impossible for him to have known the innocence and the future return of Jesus, and that Jesus should have promised him paradise, which is in the hand of the Father. The saying addressed to John and Mary is not historical; for those two were not at the foot of the cross (Syn.), and John never had a house to which to take Mary. The prayer: *My God, my God,* is only an importation of Ps. xxii. into the account of the Passion; Jesus was too original to borrow the expression of His feelings from the O. T. The same reason disproves the authenticity of the last saying: *Father, into Thy hands,* borrowed from Ps. xxxi. The *It is finished* of John is only the summary expression of the dogmatics already put by the author into the mouth of Jesus in His last discourses. The historic truth is thus reduced to two cries of Jesus: one of pain, which John has translated, not without reason, into *I thirst;* and a last cry, that of death. This silence of Jesus forms, according to Keim, the real greatness of His death.—The prayer of Jesus and His threatening are not more contradictory than divine justice and human intercession. There is room in history for the effects of both.—The prophetic form in which Jesus clothes the expression of His thoughts takes nothing from their originality.

They spring from the depths of His being, and meet with expressions which are familiar to Him, and which He employs instinctively. —John here, as throughout his Gospel, completes the synoptics.— We think we have shown how the prayer of the thief is psychologically possible. It is doing too much honour to the primitive Church to ascribe to her the invention of such sayings. If she had invented, she would not have done so in a style so chaste, so concise, so holy; once more compare the apocryphal accounts.

THIRD CYCLE.—CHAP. XXIII. 47–56.

Close of the Account of the Passion.

Vers. 47–49.[1] These verses describe the immediate effects of our Lord's death, first on the Roman centurion (ver. 47), then on the people (ver. 48), lastly on the followers of Jesus (ver. 49).—Mark says of the centurion: *When he saw.* These words relate to the last cry of Jesus and to the event of His death. In Matthew and Luke this same expression refers to all the events which had just passed.—Luke gives the saying of this Gentile in the simplest form: *This was a righteous man;* that is to say: He was no malefactor, as was supposed. But this homage implied something more; for Jesus having given Himself out to be the Son of God, if He was a righteous man, must be more than that. Such is the meaning of the centurion's exclamation in the narratives of Matthew and Mark. Twice on the cross Jesus had called God *His Father;* the centurion could therefore well express himself thus: He was really, as He alleged, the Son of God!—As the centurion's exclamation is an anticipation of the conversion of the Gentile world, so the consternation which takes possession of the Jews on witnessing the scene (ver. 48) anticipates the final penitence and conversion of this people (comp. Zech. xii. 10–14). The word *θεωρία, that sight,* alludes to the feeling of curiosity which had attracted the multitude.

Among the acquaintance of Jesus spoken of ver. 49 there must have been some of His apostles. This is the necessary

[1] Ver. 47. ℵ. B. D. L. R., ἐδόξαζεν instead of ἐδόξασεν.—Ver. 48. 7 Mjj. Syr., θεωρησαντες instead of θεωρουντες.—ℵ. A. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. omit ἑαυτων.—Ver. 49. A. B. L. P. 2 Mnn., αυτω instead of αυτου after γνωστοι.—ℵ. B. D. L. 10 Mnn. add απο before μακροθεν.

inference from the word *πάντες, all. Μακρόθεν, afar off,* discovers the fear which prevailed among them. John and Mary had come nearer the cross (John xix. 26, 27).—Luke does not name till later any of the women present. Matthew and Mark here designate Mary Magdalene, of whom John also speaks; Mary the mother of James and Joses, probably the same whom John calls Mary the wife of Cleopas, and aunt of Jesus; with the mother of the sons of Zebedee, whom Mark calls Salome, and whom John leaves unmentioned, as he does when members of his own family are in question.—The Syn. do not speak of the mother of Jesus. We ought probably to take in its literal sense the words: "*From that hour* that disciple took her unto his own home" (John xix. 27). The heart of Mary was broken on hearing the deeply tender words which Jesus had spoken to her, and she withdrew that same hour, so that she was not present at the end of the crucifixion, when the friends of Jesus and the other women came near.—*Εἱστήκεισαν, they stood,* is opposed to *ὑπέστρεφον, they returned* (ver. 48). While the people were leaving the cross, His friends assembled in sight of Jesus. The words: *beholding these things,* refer not only to the circumstances attending the death of Jesus, but also, and above all, to the departure of the terrified multitude. This minute particular, taken from the immediate impression of the witnesses, betrays a source in close connection with the fact.

Vers. 50–54.[1] *The Burial of Jesus.*—According to John, the Jewish authorities requested Pilate to have the bodies removed before the beginning of the next day, which was a Sabbath of extraordinary solemnity. For though Jesus and His companions in punishment were not yet dead, and though the law Deut. xxi. 22 did not here apply literally, they might have died before the end of the day which was about to begin, and

[1] Ver. 51. ℵ. B. C. D. L. It$^{\text{alliq.}}$, *ος προσεδεχετο* instead of *ος και προσεδεχετο* (Γ. some Mnn. Syr.); instead of *ος και αυτος προσεδεχετο* (6 Mjj. 15 Mnn.); instead of *ος και προσεδεχετο και αυτος* (T. R., with 9 Mjj.); instead of *ος προσεδεχετο και αυτος* (several Mnn. It$^{\text{alliq.}}$ Vg.).—Ver. 53. ℵ. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. It$^{\text{alliq.}}$ Vg. omit *αυτο* after *καθειλων.*—ℵ. B. C. D. It^{plerique}, Vg., *αυτον* instead of *αυτο.*—ℵ. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., *ουπω* instead of *ουδεπω.*—Ver. 54. ℵ. B. C. L. 2 Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., *παρασκευης* instead of *παρασκευη.*—16 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. omit *και* before *σαββατον,* which is read by ℵ. B. C. L. some Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg.

the day be polluted thereby all the more, because, it being a Sabbath, the bodies could not be removed.—The *crucifragium*, ordered by Pilate, was not meant to put the condemned immediately to death, but only to make it certain, which allowed of their being taken from the cross. Thus is explained the wonder of Pilate, when Joseph of Arimathea informed him that Jesus was already dead (Mark xv. 44).—The secret friends of our Lord show themselves at the time of His deepest dishonour. Already the word finds fulfilment (2 Cor. v. 14): "*The love of Christ constraineth us.*" Each evangelist characterizes Joseph in his own way. Luke: a counsellor *good and just;* he is the καλὸς κἀγαθός, the Greek ideal. Mark: an *honourable* counsellor; the Roman ideal. Matthew: a *rich* man; is this not the Jewish ideal? Luke, moreover, brings out the fact, that Joseph had not agreed to the sentence (βουλῇ), nor to the odious plan (πράξει) by which Pilate's consent had been extorted. Ἀριμαθαία is the Greek form of the name of the town *Ramathaim* (1 Sam. i. 1), Samuel's birthplace, situated in Mount Ephraim, and consequently beyond the natural limits of Judæa. But since the time spoken of in 1 Macc. xi. 34, it had been reckoned to this province; hence the expression: *a city of the Jews.* As to Joseph, he lived at Jerusalem; for he had a sepulchre there.—The received reading ὃς καὶ προσεδέχετο καὶ αὐτός, *who also himself waited,* is probably the true one; it has been variously modified, because the relation of the *also himself* to the other friends of Jesus who were previously mentioned (ver. 49) was not understood; by the double καί, Luke gives prominence to the believing character of Joseph, even when no one suspected it.

Mark (xv. 46) informs us that the shroud in which the body was wrapped was bought at the same time by Joseph. How could such a purchase be made if the day was Sabbatic, if it was the 15th Nisan? Langen answers that Ex. xii. 16 made a difference, so far as the preparation of food was concerned, between the 15th Nisan and the Sabbath properly so called, and that this difference might have extended to other matters, to purchases for example; that, besides, it was not necessary to pay on the same day. But the Talmud reverses this supposition. It expressly stipulates, that when

the 14th Nisan fell on the Sabbath day, it was lawful on that day to make preparation for the morrow, the 15th (*Mischna Pesachim*, iii. 6 *et al.*), thus sacrificing the sacredness of the Sabbath to that of the feast day. Could the latter have been less holy! There is no ground for alleging that the authorization of Ex. xii. extended beyond the strict limits of the text.

According to the Syn., the circumstance which determined the use of this sepulchre was, that it belonged to Joseph. According to John, it was its nearness to the place of punishment, taken in connection with the approach of the Sabbath. But those two circumstances are so far from being in contradiction, that the one apart from the other would have no value. What influence could the approach of the Sabbath have had in the choice of this rocky sepulchre, if it had not belonged to one of the friends of Jesus? The Syn. do not speak of the part taken by Nicodemus in the burial of Jesus. This particular, omitted by tradition, has been restored by John. It is of no consequence whether we read in ver. 54, παρασκευῆς or παρασκευή. The important point is, whether this name, which means *preparation*, denotes here the eve of the weekly Sabbath (*Friday*), or that of the Passover day (the 14th Nisan). Those who allege that Jesus was crucified on the 15th take it in the first sense; those who hold it to have been on the 14th, in the second. The text in itself admits of both views. But in the context, how can it be held, we would ask with Caspari (p. 172), that the holiest day of the feast of the year, the 15th Nisan, was here designated, like any ordinary Friday, *the preparation for the Sabbath?*—No doubt Mark, in the parall., translates this word by προσάββατον, *day before Sabbath* (xv. 42). But this expression may mean in a general way: the eve of Sabbath *or of any Sabbatic day* whatever. And in the present case it *must* have this latter sense, as appears from the ἐπεί, *because*. Mark means to explain, by the Sabbatic character of the following day, why they *made haste* to bury the body; it was *the pro-Sabbath*. What meaning would this reason have had, if the very day on which they were acting had been a Sabbatic day?—Matt. xxvii. 62 offers an analogous expression. In speaking of Saturday, the morrow after the death of Jesus, Matthew says:

"the next day, *that followed the preparation.*" We have already called attention to this expression (*Comment. sur Jean*, t. ii. p. 638). "If this Saturday," says Caspari (p. 77), "had been an ordinary Sabbath, Matthew would not have designated it in so strange a manner. The *preparation* in question must have had a character quite different from the preparation for the ordinary Sabbath. This preparation day must have been so called as a day of special preparation, as *itself* a feast day; it must have been the 14th Nisan."—The term ἐπέφωσκε, *was beginning to shine*, is figurative. It is taken from the natural day, and applied here to the civil day.

Vers. 55, 56.[1] The embalming of Jesus having been done in haste, the women proposed to complete it. This same evening, therefore, they prepared the odoriferous herbs (ἀρώματα) and the perfumed oils (μύρα) necessary for the purpose; and the hour of the Sabbath being come, they rested.—Once more, what would be the meaning of this conduct if that very day had been Sabbatic, the 15th Nisan? Evidently it was yet the 14th; and the 15th, which was about to begin, was at once the weekly Sabbath and the first Passover day, and so invested with double sacredness, as John remarks (xix. 31). —Mark says, somewhat differently (xvi. 1), that they made their preparations *when the Sabbath was past*, that is to say, on the morrow in the evening. No doubt they had not been able to finish them completely on the Friday before 6 o'clock afternoon.—The καί of the T. R. before γυναῖκες, ver. 55, is evidently a corruption of αἱ.—It has been asked how, if Jesus predicted His resurrection, the women could have prepared to embalm His body. But we have seen the answer in the case of the converted thief: they expected a glorious reappearance of Jesus from heaven after His death, but not the reviving of His body laid in the tomb.—A feeling of pious and humble fidelity is expressed in the conduct of the women, as it is described by Luke in the touching words: "*And they rested according to the commandment.*" It was the last Sabbath of the old covenant. It was scrupulously respected.

[1] Ver. 55. Instead of δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες, which T. R. reads, with some Mnn., the Mjj. read either δὲ γυναῖκες or δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες.

Conclusion regarding the Day of Jesus' Death.

It follows from the exegesis of chap. xxii. and xxiii., that according to the Syn., as well as according to John, the day of Jesus' death was not the first and great day of the paschal Feast (15th Nisan), but the day before (or *preparation*), the 14th Nisan, which that year was a Friday, and so, at the same time, the *preparation* for the Sabbath. Hence it follows also that the last Feast of Jesus took place on the evening between the 13th and 14th, and not on the evening between the 14th and 15th, when the whole people celebrated the paschal Feast. Such is the result to which we are brought by all the passages examined: xxii. 7–9, 10–15, 66, xxiii. 26, 53, 54, 55, 56; Matt. xxvi. 5, 18, xxvii. 62; Mark xiv. 2, xv. 42, 46; so that, on the main question, it appears to us that exegetically there can be no doubt, seeing that our four Gospel accounts present no real disagreement. The fact, therefore, stands as follows: On the 13th, toward evening, Jesus sent the two disciples most worthy of His confidence to prepare the paschal Feast; in the opinion of all the rest, this was with a view to the following evening, when the national Feast was to be celebrated. But Jesus knew that by that time the hour would be past for His celebrating this last Passover. This same evening, therefore, some hours after having sent the two disciples, He seated Himself at the table prepared by them and by the master of the house. There was in this a surprise for the apostles, which is probably referred to by Luke xxii. 15: "*With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.*" Above all, it was a surprise to Judas, who had resolved to give Him up this same evening. This anticipation on the part of Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath and of the whole law (vi. 5), involved nothing less than the abrogation of the paschal Feast and of the ancient covenant.

This exegetical result agrees fully with Jewish tradition. In *Bab. Sanhedr.* 43. 1, it is expressly said (Caspari, p. 156): "Jesus was executed on the eve of the Passover. A public crier had proclaimed for 70 days that a man was to be stoned for having bewitched Israel and seduced it into schism; that he who had anything to say for his justification should present himself and testify for him; but no one appeared to justify him. Then they crucified him on *the evening* [the eve] *of the Passover* (בערב פסח)." This last expression can denote nothing but the evening preceding the Passover, as ערב השבת, *evening of the Sabbath*, never denotes anything but Friday evening.—This view seems also to be that which prevailed in the Church in the most ancient times, as we see from Clement of Alexandria, who lived when primitive tradition was not yet effaced, and who professes without hesitation the same opinion.—It is, moreover, in keeping with the admirable symbolism which is the character of all God's works. Jesus dies on the afternoon of the 14th, at the very moment when the paschal lamb was slain in the temple. He rests in the tomb on the 15th Nisan, a day doubly Sabbatic that year, as being Saturday and the first day of the Feast. This day of rest, so exceptionally solemn, divides the first creation,

which is terminating, from the second, which is beginning. Jesus rises on the morrow, 16th Nisan, the very day on which there was offered in the temple the first sheaf cut in the year, the *first fruits* of the harvest.—Is it not to this symbolism that St. Paul himself alludes in the two passages: "Christ, *our Passover*, is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7); and: "Every one in his own order; Christ, *the first fruits;* afterwards they that are His, at His coming" (1 Cor. xv. 23)? It is probable, also, that if St. Paul had regarded the night on which Jesus instituted the Holy Supper as the same on which Israel celebrated the Passover, he would not have designated it simply (1 Cor. xi. 23) as that *on which our Lord was betrayed.*

The only further question which may yet appear doubtful, is whether the compilers of our three synoptic narratives had a clear view of the real course of events. They have faithfully preserved to us the facts and sayings which help us to make it out; but is there not some confusion in their minds? Was not this last feast of Christ, which had all the features of an ordinary paschal Feast, and in which He had instituted the Supper as the counterpart of the Israelitish rite, confounded in the traditional accounts with the national paschal Feast? And has not this confusion exercised a certain influence on the account of the Syn.? This, at least, is the difference which exists between them and John: they relate simply, without concerning themselves about the difference between this last Supper and the Israelitish paschal Feast; while John, who sees this confusion gaining ground, expressly emphasizes the *distinction* between the two.[1]

As to the bearing of this question on the paschal controversy of the second century, and on the authenticity of the Gospel of John, it may be explained in two ways: Either the event celebrated by the Asiatics was, as is natural, *the death* of Christ (Steitz), and not the fact of *the institution of the Supper* (Baur), and hence it would follow, in entire harmony with the fourth Gospel, that they regarded the 14th, and not the 15th, as the day of the crucifixion (this is the explanation which we have advocated in the *Comment. sur Jean*); or it may be maintained, as is done by M. E. Schürer (whose dissertation on this question[2] leaves little to be desired), that the Asiatic rite was determined neither by the day on which the Holy Supper was instituted, nor even by that on which Christ died, but solely by the desire of keeping up in the churches of Asia, for the Holy Easter Supper, the day *on which the Law ordained the paschal Feast to be celebrated.* In this case, the Asiatic rite neither contradicted nor confirmed John's narrative; it had no connection with it.

From this determination of the day of the month on which Jesus died, it remains for us to draw a conclusion regarding the year of that event. The result obtained is, that in that year the 13th

[1] We have the satisfaction of finding ourselves at one in this view with Krummel, in the *Litteraturblatt* of Darmstadt, February 1868, with M. C. Baggesen (*Der Apostel Johannes, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, 1869), and (in substance) with Caspari.

[2] *De controversiis paschalibus sec. post. Chr. n. seculo exortis*, Leipzig 1869.

Nisan, the preparation for the Passover and the day of the crucifixion, fell on a Friday, and the day of the Passover, 14th Nisan, on a Saturday. Now, it follows from the calculations of Wurm (Bengel's *Archiv.* 1816, ii.), and of Oudemann, Professor of Astronomy at Utrecht (*Revue de théol.* 1863, p. 221), whose results differ only by a few minutes, that in the years from 28 to 36 of our era, in one of which the death of Jesus must have fallen, the day of the Passover, 15th Nisan, was a Saturday only in 30 and 34 (783 and 787 A.U.C.).[1] If, then, Jesus was born (vol. i. p. 126) at the end of 749 or the beginning of 750 A.U.C., 3–4 years before our era; if He was baptized in the course of His 30th year (Luke iii. 23); if His ministry lasted about 2½ years (John); if, finally, His death took place, as all the evangelists attest, at the feast of Passover: this Passover must have been that of the year 30 of our era (783 A.U.C.). The result of astronomical calculation thus confirms the gospel statements, especially those of John. And we can fix the date of Christ's death on Friday the 14th Nisan (7th April) of the year 30.[2]

[1] Sometimes Wurm's calculation is cited to an opposite effect. But it must not be forgotten that he dates, as we do, from midnight, instead of making the days begin, as the Jews did, at sunset. This circumstance exercises a decisive influence in this case (Caspari, p. 16).

[2] Caspari places the baptism of Jesus, as we do, in 28, and His death in 30. Keim: the beginning of His ministry, in the spring of 34; the death of John the Baptist, in the autumn of 34; the death of Jesus, at the Passover of 35. Hitzig: the death of Jesus, in 36.

SEVENTH PART.

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION.

CHAP. XXIV.

IT is in this part of the Gospel narrative that the four accounts diverge most. As friends, who for a time have travelled together, disperse at the end of the journey to take each the way which brings him to his own home, so in this last part, the peculiar object of each evangelist exercises an influence on his narrative yet more marked than before. Luke, who wishes to describe the *gradual growth* of Christian work from Nazareth to Rome, prepares, in those last statements of his Gospel, for the description of the apostolic preaching and of the founding of the Church, which he is about to trace in the Acts. Matthew, whose purpose is to prove the *Messianic claims* of Jesus, closes his demonstration by narrating the most solemn appearance of the risen Jesus, when He made known to the Church His elevation to universal sovereignty, and installed the apostles in their mission as conquerors of the world. John, who relates the history of the *development of faith* in the founders of the gospel, side by side with that of incredulity in Israel, closes his narrative with the appearance which led to the profession of Thomas, and which consummated the triumph of faith over unbelief in the apostolic circle. It is vain to mutilate the conclusion of Mark's work. We find here again the characteristic feature of his narrative. He had, above all, exhibited the powerful *activity of our Lord* as a divine evangelist: the last words of his account, xvi. 19, 20, show us Jesus glorified, still co-operating from heaven with His apostles.

Each evangelist knows well the point at which he aims, and hence the reason that the narratives diverge more as they reach the conclusion. The special differences in the accounts of the resurrection are partly the effect of this principal divergence. Of the four accounts, the two extremes are that of Matthew, which puts the whole stress on the great *Galilean* appearance, and that of Luke, which relates only the appearances in *Judæa*. The other two are, as it were, middle terms. Mark (at least from xvi. 9) is dependent on the former two, and oscillates between them. John really unites them by relating, like Luke, the appearances at Jerusalem, while mentioning also, like Matthew, a remarkable appearance in Galilee. If, indeed, chap. xxi. was not composed by John, it certainly proceeds from a tradition emanating from this apostle. The fact of appearances having taken place both in Judæa and Galilee is also confirmed indirectly by Paul, as we shall see.

The account of Luke contains: 1. The visit of the women to the tomb (vers. 1–7). 2. Peter's visit to the tomb (vers. 8–12). 3. The appearance to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (vers. 13–32). 4. The appearance to the disciples on the evening of the resurrection day (vers. 33–43). 5. The last instructions of Jesus (vers. 44–49). 6. The ascension (vers. 50–53).

1. *The Women at the Sepulchre:* vers. 1–7.—Vers. 1–7.[1] The women play the first, if not the principal, part in all those accounts; a special duty called them to the tomb.—They were, according to Matt. xxviii. 1, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (the aunt of Jesus); according to Mark (xvi. 1), those same two, and Salome the mother of James and John; according to Luke (ver. 10), the first two, along with the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward (viii. 3). John names only Mary Magdalene. But does not Mary herself allude to the presence of others when she says (ver. 2): "*We know not where they have laid Him*"? If John names her so specially,

[1] The Mss. are divided between βαθιος (T. R., Byz.) and βαθεως (Alex.), and between μνημα (T. R.) and μνημειον (taken from the parall.).—א. B. C. L. 2 Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit the words και τινες συν αυταις.—Ver. 4. א. B. C. D. L., απορεισθαι instead of διαπορεισθαι.—א. B. D. It. Vg., εν εσθητι αστραπτουση instead of εν εσθησεσιν αστραπτουσαις.—Ver. 5. The Mss. are divided between το προσωπον (T. R., Byz.) and τα προσωπα (Alex.).

it is because he intends to give anew the account of the appearance which tradition had either omitted or generalized (Matthew), and which, as having taken place first, had a certain importance. As to the time of the women's arrival, Luke says, *Very early in the morning;* Matthew, ὀψὲ σαββάτων, which signifies, not *Sabbath evening,* but (like the phrases ὀψὲ μυστηρίων, *peractis mysteriis,* ὀψὲ τρωϊκῶν, after the Trojan war; see Bleek): *after the Sabbath,* in the night which followed. By the τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ, Matthew expresses the fact that it was at the time of daybreak. Mark says, with a slight difference, which only proves the independence of his narrative (to ver. 8), *At the rising of the sun.*—The object of the women was, according to Matthew, to visit the sepulchre; according to the other two, to embalm the body.

The fact of the resurrection itself is not described by any evangelist, no one having been present. Only the *Risen One* was seen. It is of Him that the evangelists bear witness. Matthew is the one who goes furthest back. An earthquake, due to the action of an angel (γάρ), shakes and dislodges the stone; the angel seats himself upon it, and the guards take to flight. Undoubtedly, it cannot be denied that this account, even in its style (the parallelism, ver. 3), has a poetic tinge. But some such *fact* is necessarily supposed by what follows. Otherwise, how would the sepulchre have been found open on the arrival of the women? It is at this point that the other accounts begin. In John, Mary Magdalene sees nothing except the stone which has been rolled away; she runs instantly to apprise Peter and John. It may be supposed that the other women did not accompany her, and that, having come near the sepulchre, they were witnesses of the appearance of the angel; then, that they returned home. Not till after that did Mary Magdalene come back with Peter and John (John xxi. 1–9). It might be supposed, indeed, that this whole account given by the Syn. regarding the appearance of the angel (Matthew and Mark), or of the two angels (Luke), to the women, is at bottom nothing more than the fact of the appearance of the angels to Mary related by John (xx. 11–13) and generalized by tradition. But vers. 22, 23 of Luke are not favourable to this view. Mary Magdalene, having seen the Lord immediately after the appearance of the angels, could not

have related the first of those facts without also mentioning the second, which was far more important.

In the angel's address, as reproduced by the Syn., everything differs, with the single exception of the words which are identical in all, *He is not here.* A common document is inadmissible. In Luke, the angel recalls to the memory of the women former promises of a resurrection. In Matthew and Mark, he reminds them, while calling on them to remind the disciples, of the rendezvous which Jesus had appointed for His own in Galilee before His death. *Προάγει, He goeth before,* like an invisible shepherd walking at the head of His visible flock. Already, indeed, before His death Jesus had shown His concern to reconstitute His Galilean Church, and that in Galilee itself (Mark xiv. 28; Matt. xxvi. 32); *ὑμᾶς, you,* cannot apply to the apostles only, to the exclusion of the women; it embraces all the faithful. It is also certain that the last words, *There ye shall see Him,* do not belong to the sayings of Jesus which the women are charged to report to the disciples. It is the angel himself who speaks, as is proved by the expression, *Lo, I have told you* (Matthew); and more clearly still by the words, *As He said unto you* (Mark). This gathering, which Jesus had in view even in Gethsemane, at the moment when He saw them ready to be scattered, and which forms the subject of the angel's message immediately after the resurrection, was intended to be the general reunion of all the faithful, who for the most part were natives of Galilee, and who formed the nucleus of the future Church of Jesus. After that, we shall not be surprised to hear St. Paul speak (1 Cor. xv.) of an assemblage of more than 500 brethren, of whom the 120 Galileans of Pentecost were the *élite* (Acts i. 15, ii. 7); comp. also the expression *my brethren* (John xx. 17), which certainly includes more than the eleven apostles. — There follows in Matthew an appearance of Jesus to the women just as they are leaving the tomb. It seems to me that this appearance can be no other than that which, according to John, was granted to Mary Magdalene. Tradition had applied it to the women in general. Comp. the expressions, *They embraced His feet* (Matthew), with the words, *Touch me not,* in John; *Tell my brethren* (Matthew), with *Go to my brethren, and say unto them,* in John. Finally, it must be remarked that in the

two accounts this appearance of Jesus immediately follows that of the angel.—In Matthew's mind, does the promise, *There shall they see me*, exclude all appearance to the apostles previous to that which is here announced? If it is so, the contradiction between this declaration and the accounts of Luke and John is glaring. But even in Matthew, the expression, *There* [in Galilee] *ye shall see me*, ver. 7, is immediately followed by an appearance of Jesus to those women, and that *in Judæa* (ver. 9); this fact proves clearly that we must not give such a negative force to Matthew's expression. What we have here is *the affirmation* of a solemn reunion which shall take place in Galilee, and at which not only the apostles, but the women and all the faithful, shall be present. That does not at all exclude special appearances granted to this or that one before the appearance here in question.

The following was therefore the course of events:—Mary Magdalene comes to the sepulchre with other women. On seeing the stone rolled away, she runs to inform the disciples; the other women remain; perhaps others besides arrived a little later (Mark). The angel declares to them the resurrection, and they return. Mary Magdalene comes back with Peter and John; then, having remained alone after their departure, she witnesses the first appearance of Jesus risen from the dead.

2. *Visit of Peter to the Sepulchre:* vers. 8–12.—Vers. 8–12.[1] As we have found the account given, John xx. 14–18, in Matthew's narrative of the appearance to the women, so we recognise here the fact which is related more in detail in John xx. 1–10.—Luke says, ver. 9, that on returning from the sepulchre the women related what they had seen and heard, while, according to Mark (ver. 8), *they kept silence.* This contradiction is explained by the fact that the two sayings refer to two different events: the first, to the account which Mary Magdalene gives to Peter and John, and which led them to the sepulchre (Luke, vers. 12 and 22–24),—a report which soon spread among the apostles and all the disciples; the

[1] Ver. 10. 13 Mjj. 45 Mnn. It$^{alliq.}$ omit αι before λοιπαι.—Ver. 11. ℵ. B. D. L. Syr. It^{plerique}, τα ρηματα ταυτα instead of τα ρηματα αυτων.—Ver. 12. This verse is entirely omitted by Dabel Fuld. Syr$^{hier.}$ It is found in 19 Mjj. all the Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ Syr$^{sch.}$ It$^{alliq.}$ Sah. Cop.

other, to the first moments which followed the return of the other women, until, their fears having abated, they began to speak. But this contradiction in terms proves that at least up to ver. 8 Mark had not Luke before him.—The *αἵ* of the T. R., ver. 10, before *ἔλεγον* is indispensable.—The omission of ver. 12 in the *Cantab.* and some copies of the Latin and Syriac translations appeared so serious a matter to Tischendorf, that he rejected this verse in his eighth edition. But if it were an interpolation taken from John, it would not have mentioned Peter only, but Peter and John (or *the other disciple*). And the apparent contradiction would have been avoided between this verse and ver. 24, where it is not *an* apostle, but *certain of them* (*τίνες*), who repair to the sepulchre. The extreme caprice and carelessness which prevail throughout cod. D and the documents of the *Itala* which are connected with it are well known. The entire body of the other Mjj. and of the Mnn., as well as most of the copies of the ancient translations, support the T. R. Some such historical fact as that mentioned in this verse is required by the declaration of the two disciples (ver. 24).—There is, besides, a striking resemblance between the account of John and that of Luke. The terms *παρακύψας, ὀθονία κείμενα, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀπελθεῖν,* are found in both.

3. *The Appearance on the way to Emmaus:* vers. 13–32. —Vers. 13–32.[1] Here is one of the most admirable pieces in Luke's Gospel. As John alone has preserved to us the account of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, so Luke alone has transmitted to us that of the appearance granted to the two disciples of Emmaus. The summary of this event in Mark (xvi. 12, 13) is evidently nothing more than an extract from Luke.

Vers. 13–16. *The Historical Introduction.*—*Ἰδού, behold,* prepares us for something unexpected. One of the two disciples was called *Cleopas* (ver. 18). This name is an abbrevia-

[1] Ver. 13. ℵ. I. K. N. Π. some Mnn., *ἑκατον ἐξηκοντα* instead of *ἑξηκοντα.*—Ver. 17. ℵ. A. (?) B. Le., *καὶ ἐσταθησαν σκυθρωπὸι* instead of *καὶ ἐστε σκυθρωποι.*—Ver. 18. ℵ. B. L. N. X., *ονοματι* instead of *ω ονομα.*—All the Mjj., Λ. excepted, omit *ἐν* before *Ἱερουσαλημ.*—Ver. 19. ℵ. B. I. L., *ναζαρηνου* instead of *ναζωραιου.*—Ver. 21. ℵ. D. B. L. add *καὶ* after *ἀλλαγε.*—ℵ. B. L. Syr. omit *σημερον.*—Ver. 28. ℵ. A. B. D. L. It[alliq.], *προσεποιησατο* instead of *προσεποιειτο.*—Ver. 29. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. It[alliq.] Vg. add *ηδη* after *κεκλικεν.*—Ver. 32. ℵ. B. D. L. omit *καὶ* before *ὡς διηνοιγεν.*

tion of Cleopatros, and not, like Κλωπας (John xix. 25), the reproduction of the Hebrew name חלפי, which Luke always translates by Ἀλφαῖος (vi. 15; Acts i. 13). This name, of Greek origin, leads to the supposition that this disciple was a proselyte come to the feast. As to the other, it has been thought (Theophylact, Lange) that it was Luke himself—first, because he is not named; and next, because of the peculiarly dramatic character of the narrative following (comp. especially ver. 32). Luke i. 2 proves nothing against this view. For the author distinguishes himself in this passage, not from *witnesses* absolutely, but from those who were *witnesses from the beginning;* and this contact for a moment did not give him the right to rank himself among the authors of the Gospel tradition. Jesus, by manifesting Himself to these two men, accomplished for the first time what He had announced to the Greeks, who asked to speak with Him in the temple: "*If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me*" (John xii. 32, 33).—Emmaus is not, as was held by Eusebius and Jerome, *Ammaus* (later Nicopolis), the modern *Anwas*, situated to the S.E. of Lydda; for this town lies 180 furlongs from Jerusalem, more than double the distance mentioned by Luke, and such a distance is incompatible with our account (ver. 23). Caspari (p. 207) has been led to the conviction previously expressed by Sepp, that this place is no other than the village *Ammaus* mentioned by Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6), which Titus assigned to 800 veterans of his army to found a colony. This place, situated E.S.E. from Jerusalem, is called even at the present day *Kolonich*, and is distant exactly 60 furlongs from Jerusalem. In *Succa* iv. 5, the Talmud says that there, at *Maûza* (with the article: Hama Maûza), they go to gather the green boughs for the feast of Tabernacles; elsewhere it is said that "Maûza is Kolonieh." —The *reasoning*, συζητεῖν (ver. 15), bore, according to ver. 21, on the force of the promises of Jesus. The ἐκρατοῦντο, *were holden* (ver. 16), is explained by the concurrence of two factors: the incredulity of the disciples regarding the bodily resurrection of Jesus (comp. ver. 25), and a mysterious change which had been wrought on the person of our Lord (comp. Mark xvi. 12: ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ, and John xx. 15, *supposing Him to be the gardener* . . .).

Vers. 17–19*a*. *Beginning of the Conversation.*—Ver. 17. Jesus generally interrogates before instructing. As a good teacher, in order to be heard, He begins by causing his auditors to speak (John i. 38).—The Alex. reading at the end of ver. 17, allowed by Tischendorf (8th ed.): *and stood sad,* borders on the absurd.—Ver. 18. *Μόνος* belongs to both verbs, *παροικεῖς* and *οὐκ ἔγνως*, together. They take Jesus for one of those numerous strangers who, like themselves, are temporarily sojourning at Jerusalem. An inhabitant of the city would not have failed to know these things; and in their view, to know them was to be engrossed with them.

Vers. 19*b*–24. *Account of the Two Disciples.*—Jesus has now brought them to the point where He wished, namely, to open up their heart to Him; *σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις* (ver. 21), in spite of the extraordinary qualities described ver. 19.—*Ἄγει* may be taken impersonally, as in Latin, *agit diem,* for *agitur dies.* But it may also have Jesus for its subject, as in the phrase *ἄγει δεκατὸν ἔτος*, "he is in his tenth year." But along with those causes of discouragement, there are also grounds of hope. This opposition is indicated by *ἀλλὰ καί*, "*But indeed there are also . . .*" (ver. 22).—Ver. 23. *Λέγουσαι, οἱ λέγουσιν*, hearsay of a hearsay. This form shows how little faith they put in all those reports (comp. ver. 11).—Ver. 24. Peter, then, was not the only one, as he seemed to be from ver. 12. Here is an example, among many others, of the traps which are unintentionally laid for criticism by the simple and artless style of our sacred historians. On each occasion they say simply what the context calls for, omitting everything which goes beyond, but sometimes, as here, adding it themselves later (John iii. 22; comp. with iv. 2). The last words, *Him they saw not,* prove that the two disciples set out from Jerusalem between the return of the women and that of Peter and John, and even of Mary Magdalene.

Vers. 25–27. *The Teaching of Jesus.*—The *καὶ αὐτός, then He* (ver. 25), shows that His turn has now come. They have said everything—they have opened their heart; now it is for Him to fill it with new things. And first, in the way of rebuke (ver. 25). *Ἀνοητοί, fools,* refers to the understanding; *βραδεῖς, slow,* to the heart. If they had embraced the living God with more fervent faith, the fact of the resurrection

would not have been so strange to their hopes (xx. 37, 38). —Next, in the way of instruction (vers. 26 and 27). Ver. 26 is the central word of this narrative. The explanation of the ἔδει, *ought*, was no doubt rather exegetical than dogmatical; it turned on the text presented by the prophecies (ver. 27).— Jesus had before Him a grand field, from the Protevangelium down to Mal. iv. In studying the Scriptures for Himself, He had found Himself in them everywhere (John v. 39, 40). He had now only to let this light which filled His heart ray forth from Him. The second ἀπό (ver. 27) shows that the demonstration began anew with every prophet.

Vers. 28–32. *Historical Conclusion.*—When Jesus *made* as if He would continue His journey, it was not a mere feint. He would have really gone, but for that sort of constraint which they exercised over Him. Every gift of God is an invitation to claim a greater (χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, John i. 16). But most men stop very quickly on this way; and thus they never reach the full blessing (2 Kings xiii. 14–19). The verb κατακλιθῆναι, *to sit down at table* (ver. 30), applies to a common meal, and does not involve the idea of a Holy Supper. Acting as head of the family, Jesus takes the bread and gives thanks. The word διηνοίχθησαν, *were opened* (ver. 31), is contrasted with the preceding, *were holden*, ver. 16. It indicates a divine operation, which destroys the effect of the causes referred to, ver. 16. No doubt the influence exercised on their heart by the preceding conversation and by the thanksgiving of Jesus, as well as the manner in which He broke and distributed the bread, had prepared them for this awaking of the inner sense. The sudden disappearance of Jesus has a supernatural character. His body was already in course of glorification, and obeyed more freely than before the will of the spirit. Besides, it must be remembered that Jesus, strictly speaking, *was* already *no more with them* (ver. 44), and that the miracle consisted rather in His appearing than in His disappearing.—The saying, so intimate in its character, which is preserved ver. 32, in any case betrays a source close to the event itself; tradition would not have invented such a saying.

If we accept the view which recognises Luke himself in the companion of Cleopas, we shall find ourselves brought to this critical result, that each evangelist has left in a corner of his narrative a

modest indication of his person: Matthew, in the publican whom Jesus removes by a word from his previous occupations; Mark, in the young man who flees, leaving his garment at Gethsemane; John, in the disciple designated as he whom Jesus loved; Luke, in the anonymous traveller of Emmaus.

4. *The Appearance to the Apostles:* vers. 33–43.—Vers. 33–43.[1] The two travellers, immediately changing their intended route, return to Jerusalem, where they find the apostles assembled and full of joy. An appearance of Jesus to Peter had overcome all the doubts left by the accounts of the women. This appearance should probably be placed at the time when Peter returned home (ver. 12), after his visit to the tomb. Paul places it (1 Cor. xv.) first of all. He omits Luke's first (the two going to Emmaus) and John's first (Mary Magdalene). For where apostolic testimony is in question, as in that chapter, unofficial witnesses, not *chosen* (Acts i. 2), are left out of account. Peter was not at that time restored as an apostle (comp. John xxi.), but he received his pardon as a believer. If tradition had invented, would it not, above all, have imagined an appearance to John?—This account refers to the same appearance as John xx. 19–23. The two Gospels place it on the evening of the resurrection day. The sudden appearance of Jesus, ver. 36, indicated by the words: *He stood in the midst of them,* is evidently supernatural, like His disappearance (ver. 31). Its miraculous character is expressed still more precisely by John, *The doors were shut.* The salutation would be the same in both accounts: *Peace be unto you,* were we not obliged to give the preference here to the text of the *Cantab.* and of some copies of the *Itala,* which rejects these words. The T. R. has probably been interpolated from John.—The term *πνεῦμα* (ver. 37) denotes *the spirit* of the dead returning without a body from Hades, and appearing in a visible form as *umbra, φάντασμα* (Matt. xiv. 26). This impression naturally arose from the sudden and miraculous appearance of Jesus. The *διαλογισμοί, inward disputings,* are contrasted with the simple acknowledgment of Him who

[1] Ver. 33. ℵ. B. D., *ηθροισμενους* instead of *συνηθροισμενους.*—Ver. 36. D. It$^{alliq.}$ omit the words *και λεγει αυτοις ειρηνη υμιν.*—Ver. 38. B. D. It^{plerique}, *εν τη καρδια* instead of *εν ταις καρδιαις.*—Ver. 39. ℵ. D. Ir., *σαρκας* instead of *σαρκα.*—Ver. 40. This verse is omitted by D. It$^{alliq.}$ Syr$^{cur.}$—Ver. 42. ℵ. A. B. D. L. Π. Clement, Or. omit *και απο μελισσιου κηριου,* which is read by T. R. 12 Mjj. all the Mnn. Syr. It$^{alliq.}$ Justin, etc.

stands before them.—At ver. 39, Jesus asserts His identity: "*That it is I myself,*" and then His corporeity: "*Handle me, and see.*" The sight of His hands and feet proves those two propositions by the wounds, the marks of which they still bear. Ver. 40 is wanting in D. It^{aliq}. It might be suspected that it is taken from John xx. 20, if in this latter passage, instead of *His feet,* there was not *His side.*—In vers. 41–43, Jesus gives them a new proof of His corporeity by eating meats which they had to offer Him. Their very joy prevented them from believing in so great a happiness, and formed an obstacle to their faith.—Strauss finds a contradiction between the act of eating and the notion of a glorified body. But the body of Jesus was in a transition state. Our Lord Himself says to Mary Magdalene: "*I am not yet ascended . . .,* but *I ascend*" (John xx. 17). On the one hand, then, He still had His terrestrial body. On the other, this body was already raised to a higher condition. We have no experience to help us in forming a clear idea of this transition, any more than of its goal, the glorified body.—The omission of the words: *and of an honey-comb,* in the Alex., is probably due to the confusion of the καί which precedes with that which follows.

This appearance of Jesus in the midst of the apostles, related by John and Luke, is also mentioned by Mark (xvi. 14) and by Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5). But John alone distinguishes it from that which took place eight days after in similar circumstances, and at which the doubts of Thomas were overcome. And would it be too daring to suppose that, as the first of those appearances was meant to gather together the apostles whom Jesus wished to bring to Galilee, the second was intended to complete this reunion, which was hindered by the obstinate resistance of Thomas; consequently, that it was the unbelief of this disciple which prevented the immediate return of the apostles to Galilee, and forced them to remain at Jerusalem during the whole paschal week? Jesus did not lead back the flock until He had the number completed: "*Of those whom Thou gavest me none is lost.*"

5. *The last Instructions:* vers. 44–49. — Vers. 44–49.[1]

[1] Ver. 44. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., προς αυτους instead of αυτοις. —8 Mjj. some Mnn, omit μου after λογοι.— Ver. 46. ℵ. B. C. D. L. It^{plerique}, omit

Meyer, Bleek, and others think that all the sayings which follow were uttered this same evening, and that the ascension itself must, according to Luke, have followed immediately, during the night or toward morning. Luke corrected himself later in the Acts, where, according to a more exact tradition, he puts an interval of forty days between the resurrection and the ascension. A circumstance which might be urged in favour of this hypothesis is, that what Luke omits in the angel's message (ver. 6) is precisely the command to the disciples to return to Galilee. But, on the other hand: 1. May it not be supposed that Luke, having reached the end of the first part of his history, and having the intention of repeating those facts as the point of departure for his second, thought it enough to state them in the most summary way? 2. Is it probable that an author, when beginning the second part of a history, should modify most materially, without in the least apprising his reader, the recital of facts with which he has closed his first? Would it not have been simpler and more honest on the part of Luke to correct the last page of his first volume, instead of confirming it implicitly as he does, Acts i. 1, 2? 3. The τότε, *then* (ver. 45), may embrace an indefinite space of time. 4. This more general sense harmonizes with the fragmentary character of the report given of those last utterances: *Now He said unto them*, ver. 44: *and He said unto them*, ver. 46. This inexact form shows clearly that Luke abandons narrative strictly so called, to give as he closes the contents of the last sayings of Jesus, reserving to himself to develope later the historical account of those last days. 5. The author of our Gospel followed the same tradition as Paul (see the appearance to Peter, mentioned only by Paul and Luke). It is, moreover, impossible, considering his relations to that apostle and to the churches of Greece, that he was not acquainted with the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Now, in this epistle a considerable interval is necessarily supposed between the resurrection and the ascension, first because it

και ουτως δει after γεγραπται.—Ver. 47. ℵ. B. Syr$^{sch.}$, μετανοιαν εις αφεσιν instead of μετανοιαν και αφεσιν.—ℵ. B. C. L. N. X., αρξαμενοι instead of αρξαμενον.—Ver. 48. B. D. omit εστε before μαρτυρες.—Ver. 49. ℵ. D. L. Syr$^{sch.}$ It^{plerique}, Vg. omit ιδου.—ℵ^{c} B. L. X. Δ., εξαποστελλω instead of αποστελλω.—ℵ. B. C. D. L. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit Ιερουσαλημ after πολει.

mentions an appearance of Jesus to more than 500 brethren, which cannot have taken place on the very day of the resurrection; and next, because it expressly distinguishes two appearances to the assembled apostles: the one undoubtedly that the account of which we have just been reading (1 Cor. xv. 6); the other, which must have taken place later (ver. 7). These facts, irreconcilable with the idea attributed by Meyer and others to Luke, belonged, as Paul himself tells us, 1 Cor. xv. 1–3, to the teaching generally received in the Church, to the παράδοσις. How could they have been unknown to such an investigator as Luke? How could they have escaped him in his first book, and that to recur to him without his saying a word in the second? Luke therefore here indicates summarily the substance of the different instructions given by Jesus between His resurrection and ascension all comprised in the words of the Acts: "*After that He had given commandments unto the apostles*" (Acts i. 2).—Ver. 44 relates how Jesus recalled to them His previous predictions regarding His death and resurrection, which fulfilled the prophecies of the O. T.—Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι, an abridged phrase for ταῦτα ἐστιν οἱ λόγοι: "These events which have just come to pass are those of which I told you in the discourses which you did not understand." The expression: *while I was yet with you*, is remarkable; for it proves that, in the mind of Jesus, His separation from them was now consummated. He was with them only exceptionally; His abode was elsewhere.—The three terms: *Moses, Prophets, Psalms*, may denote the three parts of the O. T. among the Jews: the Pentateuch; the Prophets, comprising, with the historical books (up to the exile), the prophetical books; the Psalms, as representing the entire group of the hagiographa. Bleek rather thinks that Jesus mentions here only the books most essential from a prophetic point of view (περὶ ἐμοῦ). If it is once admitted that the division of the canon which we have indicated existed so early as the time of Jesus, the first meaning is the more natural.

Jesus closes these explanations by an act of power for which they were meant to prepare. He opens the inner sense of His apostles, so that the Scriptures shall henceforth cease to be to them a sealed book. This act is certainly the same as that described by John in the words (xx. 22): "*And He*

breathed on them, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The only difference is, that John names the efficient cause, Luke the effect produced. The miracle is the same as that which Jesus shall one day work upon Israel collectively, *when the veil shall be taken away* (2 Cor. iii. 15, 16).

At ver. 46 there begins a new *resumé*—that of the discourses of the risen Jesus referring to the future, as the preceding bore on the past of the kingdom of God. *Καὶ εἶπεν, and He said to them again.* So true is it that Luke here gives the summary of the instructions of Jesus during the forty days (Acts i. 3), that we find the parallels of these verses scattered up and down in the discourses which the other Gospels give between the resurrection and ascension. The words: *should be preached among all nations,* recall Matt. xxviii. 19: "*Go and teach all nations,*" and Mark xvi. 15: "*Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.*" The words: *preaching repentance and remission of sins,* recall John xx. 23: "*Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.*" Ver. 46 forms the transition from the past to the future (ver. 47). "*Οτι depends on: *it was so,* understood.—The omission of *καὶ οὕτως ἔδει, thus it behoved,* by the Alex. cannot be justified; it has arisen from negligence. Jesus declares two necessities: the one founded on prophecy (*thus it is written*), the other on the very nature of things (*it behoved*). The Alex. reading: *repentance unto pardon,* instead of: *repentance and pardon,* has no internal probability. It would be a phrase without analogy in the whole of the N. T.—The partic. *ἀρξάμενον* is a neut. impersonal accusative, used as a gerund. The Alex. reading *ἀρξάμενοι* is a correction.—The thought that the kingdom of God must spread from Jerusalem belonged also to prophecy (Ps. cx. 2, *et al.*); comp. Acts i. 8, where this idea is developed.

To carry out this work of preaching, there must be men specially charged with it. These are the apostles (ver. 48). Hence the *ὑμεῖς, ye,* heading the proposition. The thought of ver. 48 is found John xv. 27: that of ver. 49, John xv. 26. —A testimony so important can only be given worthily and effectively with divine aid (ver. 49). Ἰδού, *behold,* expresses the unforeseen character of this intervention of divine strength; and *ἐγώ, I,* is put foremost as the correlative of *ὑμεῖς, ye* (ver.

48): "Ye, on the earth, give testimony; and I, from heaven, give you power to do so." When the disciples shall feel the spirit of Pentecost, they shall know that it is the breath of Jesus glorified, and for what end it is imparted to them. In the phrase: *the promise of the Father*, the word *promise* denotes the thing promised. The Holy Spirit is the divine promise *par excellence*. It is in this supreme gift that all others are to terminate. And this aid is so indispensable to them, that they must beware of beginning the work before having received it. The command to *tarry in the city* is no wise incompatible with a return of the disciples to Galilee between the resurrection and ascension. Everything depends on the time when Jesus spoke this word; it is not specified in the context. According to Acts i. 4, it was on the day of His ascension that Jesus gave them this command. The Alex. reject the word *Jerusalem*, which indeed is not necessary after ver. 47.

On the Resurrection of Jesus.

I. The *fact* of the resurrection.—The apostles *bore witness* to the resurrection of Jesus, and on this testimony founded the Church. Such is the indubitable historical fact. Yet more: they did not do this *as impostors*. Strauss acknowledges this. And Volkmar, in his mystical language, goes the length of saying: "It is one of the most certain facts in the history of humanity, that shortly after His death on the cross, Jesus appeared to the apostles, risen from the dead, however we may understand the fact, which is without analogy in history" (*die Evangel.* p. 612). Let us seek the explanation of the fact.

Did Jesus return to life from a state of *lethargy*, as Schleiermacher thought? Strauss has once for all executed justice on this hypothesis. It cannot even be maintained without destroying the moral character of our Lord (comp. our *Comm. sur Jean*, t. ii. p. 660 et seq.).

Were those appearances of Jesus to the first believers only *visions* resulting from their exalted state of mind? This is the hypothesis which Strauss, followed by nearly all modern rationalism, substitutes for that of Schleiermacher. This explanation breaks down before the following facts:—

1. The apostles did not in the least expect the body of Jesus to be restored to life. They confounded the resurrection, as Weizsäcker says, with the Parousia. Now, such hallucinations would suppose, on the contrary, a lively expectation of the bodily reappearance of Jesus.

2. So far was the imagination of the disciples from creating the sensible presence of Jesus, that at the first they did not recognise Him (Mary Magdalene, the two of Emmaus). Jesus was certainly not to them an expected person, whose image was conceived in their own soul.

3. We can imagine the possibility of a hallucination in one person, but not in two, twelve, and finally, five hundred! especially if it be remembered that in the appearances described we have not to do with a simple luminous figure floating between heaven and earth, but with a person performing positive acts and uttering exact statements, which were heard by the witnesses. Or is the truth of the different accounts to be suspected? But they formed, from the beginning, during the lifetime of the apostles and first witnesses, the substance of the public preaching, of the received tradition (1 Cor. xv.). Thus we should be thrown back on the hypothesis of imposture.

4. The empty tomb and the disappearance of the body remain inexplicable. If, as the narratives allege, the body remained in the hands of Jesus' friends, the testimony which they gave to its resurrection is an imposture, a hypothesis already discarded. If it remained in the hands of the Jews, how did they not by this mode of conviction overthrow the testimony of the apostles? Their mouths would have been closed much more effectually in this way than by scourging them. We shall not enter into the discussion of all Strauss's expedients to escape from this dilemna. They betray the spirit of special pleading, and can only appear to the unprejudiced mind in the light of subterfuges.[1] But Strauss attempts to take the offensive. Starting from Paul's enumeration of the various appearances (1 Cor. xv.), he reasons thus: Paul himself had a *vision* on the way to Damascus; now he put all the appearances which the apostles had on the same platform; therefore they are all nothing but visions. This reasoning is a mere sophism. If Strauss means that Paul himself *regarded* the appearance which had converted him as a simple vision, it is easy to refute him. For what Paul wishes to demonstrate, 1 Cor. xv., is the *bodily* resurrection of believers, which he cannot do by means of the appearances of Jesus, unless he regards them all as bodily, the one as well as the other. If Strauss means, on the contrary, that the Damascus appearance was really nothing else than a vision, though Paul took it as a reality, the conclusion which he draws from this mistake of Paul's, as to the meaning which must be given to all the others, has not the least logical value.

Or, finally, could God have permitted the *Spirit* of the glorified Jesus, manifesting itself to the disciples, to produce effects in them similar to those which a perception by the senses would have produced? So Weisse and Lotze think. Keim has also declared for this hypothesis in his *Life of Jesus*.[2] But, 1. What then of the

[1] In opposition to Strauss's supposition, that the body of Jesus was thrown to the dunghill, we set this fact of public notoriety in the time of St. Paul: "*He was buried*" (1 Cor. xv. 3).

[2] Otherwise in his *Geschichtl. Christus.*

narratives in which we see the Risen One seeking to demonstrate to the apostles that He is not a *pure spirit* (Luke xxiv. 37–40)? They are pure inventions, audacious falsehoods. 2. As to this glorified Jesus, who appeared spiritually to the apostles, did He or did He not mean to produce on them the impression that He was present bodily? If He did, this heavenly Being was an impostor. If not, He must have been very unskilful in His manifestations. In both cases, He is the author of the misunderstanding which gave rise to the false testimony given involuntarily by the apostles. 3. The empty tomb remains unexplained on this hypothesis, as well as on the preceding. Keim has added nothing to what his predecessors have advanced to solve this difficulty. In reality, there is but one sufficient account to be given of the empty tomb: the tomb was found empty, because He who had been laid there Himself rose from it.—To this opinion of Keim we may apply what holds of his explanation of miracles, and of his way of looking at the life of Jesus in general: it is too much or too little supernatural. It is not worth while combating the Biblical accounts, when such enormous concessions are made to them; to deny, for example, the miraculous birth, when we admit the absolute holiness of Christ, or the bodily resurrection, when we grant the reality of the appearances of the glorified Jesus. Keim for some time ascended the scale; now he descends again. He could not stop there.

II. The *accounts* of the resurrection.—These accounts are in reality only reports regarding the appearances of the Risen One. The most ancient and the most official, if one may so speak, is that of *Paul*, 1 Cor. xv. It is the summary of the oral teaching received in the Church (ver. 2), of the tradition proceeding from all the apostles together (vers. 11–15). Paul enumerates the six appearances as follows: 1. to Cephas; 2. to the Twelve; 3. to the 500; 4. to James; 5. to the Twelve; 6. to himself. We easily make out in *Luke*, Nos. 1, 2, 5 in his Gospel (xxiv. 34, ver. 36 et seq., ver. 50 et seq.); No. 6 in the Acts. The appearance to James became food for Judeo-Christian legends. It is elaborated in the apocryphal books. There remains No. 3, the appearance to the 500. A strange and instructive fact! No appearance of Jesus is better authenticated, more unassailable; none was more public, and none produced in the Church so decisive an effect . . .; and it is not mentioned, at least as such, in any of our four Gospel accounts! How should this fact put us on our guard against the *argumentum è silentio*, of which the criticism of the present day makes so unbridled a use! How it ought to show the complete ignorance in which we are still left, and probably shall ever be, of the circumstances which presided over the formation of that oral tradition which has exercised so decisive an influence over our gospel historiography! Luke could not be ignorant of this fact if he had read but once the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, conversed once on the subject with St. Paul . . .; and he has not mentioned, nor even dropped a hint of it! To bring down the composition of Luke by half a century to explain this omission, serves no end. For the further the time is brought down, the more im-

possible is it that the author of the Gospel should not have known the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians.

Matthew's account mentions only the two following appearances: 1. to the women at Jerusalem; 2. to the Eleven, on a mountain of Galilee, where Jesus had appointed them to meet Him (*οὗ ἐτάξατο πορεύεσθαι*). We at once recognise in No. 1 the appearance to Mary Magdalene, John xx. 1–17. The second is that gathering which Jesus had convoked, according to Matthew and Mark, before His death; then, immediately after the resurrection, either by the angel or by His own mouth (Matthew). But it is now only that Matthew tells us of the rendezvous appointed for the disciples *on the mountain*. This confirms the opinion which we had already reached, viz. that we have here to do with a call which was not addressed to the Eleven only, but to all believers, even to the women. Jesus wished again to see all His *brethren*, and to constitute His flock anew, which had been scattered by the death of the Shepherd. The choice of such a locality as that which Jesus had designated, confirms the conclusion that we have here to do with a numerous reunion. We cannot therefore doubt that it is the assembly of 500 spoken of by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. If Matthew does not expressly mention more than the Eleven, it is because to them was addressed the commission given by Jesus, "to go and baptize all nations." The expression: "*but some doubted*," is also more easily explained, if the Eleven were not alone.[1] Matthew did not intend to relate the first appearances by which the apostles, whether individually or together, were led to believe (this was the object of the appearances which took place at Jerusalem, and which are mentioned by Luke and John), but that which, in keeping with the spirit of his Gospel, he wished to set in relief as the climax of his history,—that, namely, to which he had made allusion from the beginning, and which may be called the Messiah's taking possession of the whole world.

Mark's account is original as far as ver. 8. At ver. 9 we find: 1. an entirely new beginning; 2. from ver. 8 a clearly marked dependence on Luke. After that, there occur from ver. 15, and especially in ver. 17, some very original sayings, which indicate an independent source. The composition of the work thus seems to have been interrupted at ver. 8, and the book to have remained unfinished. A sure proof of this is, that the appearance of Jesus announced to the women by the angel, ver. 7, is totally wanting, if, with the *Sinaït.*, the *Vatic.*, and other authorities, the Gospel is closed at ver. 8. From ver. 9, a conclusion has thus been added by means of our Gospel of Luke, which had appeared in the interval, and of some original materials previously collected with this view by the author (vers. 15, 16, and especially 17, 18).

III. The accounts *taken as a whole*.—If, gathering those scattered accounts, we unite them in one, we find ten appearances. In the

[1] If this expression is to be applied to the Eleven themselves, it must be explained by the summary character of this account, in which the first doubts expressed in the preceding appearances are applied to this, the only one related.

first three, Jesus comforts and raises, for He has to do with downcast hearts: He comforts Mary Magdalene, who seeks His lost body; He raises Peter after his fall; He reanimates the hope of the two going to Emmaus. Thereafter, in the following three, He establishes the faith of His future witnesses in the decisive fact of His resurrection; He fulfils this mission toward the apostles in general, and toward Thomas; and He reconstitutes the apostolate by returning to it its head. In the seventh and eighth appearances, He impresses on the apostolate that powerful missionary impulse which lasts still, and He adds James to the disciples, specially with a view to the mission for Israel. In the last two, finally, He completes the preceding commands by some special instructions (not to leave Jerusalem, to wait for the Spirit, etc.), and bids them His last farewell; then, shortly afterwards, He calls Paul specially with a view to the Gentiles. This unity, so profoundly psychological, so holily organic, is not the work of any of the evangelists, for its elements are scattered over the four accounts. The wisdom and love of Christ are its only authors.[1]

IV. The *importance* of the resurrection.—This event is not merely intended to *mark out* Jesus as the Saviour; it is *salvation* itself, condemnation removed, death vanquished. We were perishing, condemned: Jesus dies. His death saves us; He is the first who enjoys salvation. He rises again; then in Him we are made to live again. Such an event is everything, includes everything, or it has no existence.

6. *The Ascension:* vers. 50–53.—The resurrection restored humanity in that one of its members who, by His holy life and expiatory death, conquered our two enemies—the law which condemned us because of sin, and death, which overtook us because of the condemnation of the law (1 Cor. xv. 56). As this humanity is restored in the person of Christ by the fact of His resurrection, the ascension raises it to its full height; it realizes its destination, which from the beginning was to serve as a free instrument for the operations of the infinite God.

Vers. 50–53.[2] *The Ascension.*—Luke alone, in his Gospel

[1] See the remarkable development of this thought by M. Gess, in his new work, *Christi Zeugniss von seiner Person und seinem Werk*, 1870, p. 193 et seq. "This progression in the appearances of Jesus is so wisely graduated, that we are not at liberty to refer it to a purely subjective origin. Supposing they were all related by one and the same evangelist, it might doubtless be attempted to make him the author of so well ordered a plan. But as this arrangement results only from combining the first, the third, and the fourth Gospels . . ., this explanation also is excluded." Page 204.

[2] Ver. 50. A. B. C. L. some Mnn. Syr^{sch}. omit ἐξω after αυτους.—א. B. C. D. L. 2 Mnn., εως προς instead of εως εις.—Ver. 51. א. D. It^{alliq}. omit the words και

and in the Acts, has given us a detailed view of the scene which is indicated by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 7, and assumed throughout the whole N. T. Interpreters like Meyer think themselves obliged to limit the ascension of Jesus to a purely spiritual elevation, and to admit no external visible fact in which this elevation was manifested. Luke's account was the production of a later tradition. We shall examine this hypothesis at the close.

The meaning of the ἐξήγαγε δέ, *then He led them,* is simply this: "*All these instructions finished,* He led them . . ." This expression says absolutely nothing as to the time when the event took place.—The term συναλιζόμενος, *having assembled,* Acts i. 4, proves that Jesus had specially convoked the apostles in order to take leave of them.—Ἕως εἰς (T. R.), and still more decidedly ἕως πρός (Alex.), signifies, not *as far as,* but *to about,* in the direction and even to the neighbourhood of . . . There is thus no contradiction to Acts i. 12.[1] Like the high priest when, coming forth from the temple, he blessed the people, Jesus comes forth from the invisible world once more, before altogether shutting Himself up within it, and gives His own a last benediction. Then, in the act of performing this deed of love, He is withdrawn to a distance from them towards the top of the mountain, and His visible presence vanishes from their eyes. The words καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν are omitted in the *Sinait.*, the *Cantab.*, and some copies of the *Itala.* Could this phrase be the gloss of a copyist? But a gloss would probably have been borrowed from the narrative of the Acts, and that book presents no analogous expression. Might not this omission rather be, like so many others, the result of negligence, perhaps of confounding the two καί? We can hardly believe that Luke would have said so curtly, *He was parted from them,* without adding how. The imperfect ἀνεφέρετο, *He was carried up,* forms a picture. It reminds us of the θεωρεῖν, *behold,* John vi. 62. The *Cantab.* and some MSS. of the *Itala* omit (ver. 52) the word προσκυνήσαντες,

ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον.—Ver. 52. D. It^{aliq}. omit the words προσκυνησαντες αυτον.—Ver. 53. D. It^{aliq}. omit the words και ευλογουντες.—א. B. C. L. omit αινουντες και.—א. C. D. L. Π. some Mnn. It^{aliq}. omit αμην.

[1] See the interesting passage of M. Félix Bovet on the spot from which the ascension took place, *Voyage en Terre-Sainte,* p. 225 et seq.

having worshipped Him, perhaps in consequence of confounding *αὐταί* and *αὐτόν*. The verb *προσκυνεῖν, to prostrate oneself*, in this context, can mean only the adoration which is paid to a divine being (Ps. ii. 12).—The joy of the disciples caused by this elevation of their Master, which is the pledge of the victory of His cause, fulfilled the word of Jesus: "*If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I go to my Father*" (John xiv. 28). The point to be determined is, whether the more detailed account in Acts (the cloud, the two glorified men who appear) is an amplification of the scene due to the pen of Luke, or whether the account in the Gospel was only a sketch which he proposed to complete at the beginning of his second treatise, of which this scene was to form the starting-point. If our explanation of vers. 44–49 is well founded, we cannot but incline to the second view. And the more we recognise up to this point in Luke an author who writes conscientiously and from conviction, the more shall we feel obliged to reject the first alternative.—The numerous omissions, vers. 52, 53, in the *Cantab.* and some MSS. of the *Itala* cannot well be explained, except by the haste which the copyists seem to have made as they approached the end of their work. Or should the preference be given, as Tischendorf gives it, to this abridged text, contrary to all the other authorities together? D a b, which read *αἰνοῦντες* without *καὶ εὐλογοῦντες*; ℵ. B. C. L., which read *εὐλογοῦντες* without *αἰνοῦντες καί*, mutually condemn one another, and so confirm the received reading, *praising and blessing God.* Perhaps the omission in both cases arises from confounding the two *—ντες*. *Αἰνεῖν, to praise*, refers to the person of God; *εὐλογεῖν, to bless*, to His benefits. The disciples do here what was done at the beginning by the shepherds (ii. 20). But what a way traversed, what a series of glorious benefits between those two acts of homage! The last words, these in particular: "*They were continually in the temple*," form the transition to the book of Acts.

On the Ascension.

At first the apostles regarded the ascension as only the last of those numerous disappearances which they had witnessed during the forty days (*ἄφαντος ἐγένετο*, ver. 31). Jesus regarded it as the elevation of His person, *in the character of Son of man*, to that *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* (Phil. ii. 6), that divine state which He had renounced when

He came under the conditions of human existence. Having reached the term of His earthly career, He had asked back *His glory* (John xvii. 5); the ascension was the answer to His prayer.

Modern criticism objects to the reality of the ascension as an external fact, on the ground of the Copernican system, which excludes the belief that heaven is a particular place situated above our heads and beyond the stars. Those who raise this objection labour under a very gross misunderstanding. According to the Biblical view, the ascension is not the exchange of one place for another; it is a change *of state*, and this change is precisely the emancipation from all confinement within the limits of space, exaltation to omnipresence. The *cloud* was, as it were, the veil which covered this transformation. The *right hand* of a God everywhere present cannot designate a particular place. Sitting at the right hand of God must also include omniscience, which is closely bound up with omnipresence, as well as omnipotence, of which the right hand of God is the natural symbol. The Apocalypse expresses in its figurative language the true meaning of the ascension, when it represents the glorified Son of man as the Lamb with seven horns (omnipotence) and seven eyes (omniscience). This divine mode of being does not exclude bodily existence in the case of Jesus. Comp., in Paul, the σωματικῶς, *bodily*, Col. ii. 9, and the expression *spiritual body* applied to the second Adam, 1 Cor. xv. 44. We cannot, from experience, form an idea of this glorified bodily existence. But it may be conceived as a power of appearing sensibly and of external activity, operating at the pleasure of the will alone, and at every point of space.

Another objection is taken from the omission of this scene in the other Biblical documents.—But, 1. *Paul* expressly mentions an appearance to *all the apostles*, 1 Cor. xv. 7. Placed at the close of the whole series of previous appearances (among them that to the 500), and immediately before that which decided his own conversion, this appearance can only be the one at the ascension as related by Luke. This fact is decisive; for, according to vers. 3 and 11, it is the παράδοσις, the general tradition of the churches, proceeding from the apostles, which Paul sums up in this passage.—2. However *Mark's* mutilated conclusion may be explained, the words: "So then, after the Lord had thus spoken unto them, *He was received up into heaven*, and sat on the right hand of God," suppose some sensible fact or other, which served as a basis for such expressions. The same holds of the innumerable declarations of the *epistles* (Paul, Peter, Hebrews, James), which speak of the heavenly glory of Jesus, and of His sitting at the right hand of God. Doctrines, with the apostles, are never more than the commentary on facts. Such expressions must have a historical substratum.—3. No doubt, *John* does not relate the ascension. But can it be said that he does not mention it, when this saying occurs in his Gospel (vi. 62): "*What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?*" The term θεωρεῖν, strictly *to contemplate*, and the pres. partic. ἀναβαίνοντα, *ascending*, forbid us to think of an event of a purely spiritual

nature (comp. Bäumlein, *ad. h. l.*). Why, then, does he not relate the historical scene of the ascension? Because, as his starting-point was taken *after* the baptism, which on this account he does not relate, his conclusion is placed *before* the ascension, which for this reason he leaves unrelated. The idea of his book was the development of faith in the minds of the apostles from its birth to its consummation. Now their faith was born with the visit of John and Andrew, chap. i., after the baptism; and it had received the seal of perfection in the profession of Thomas, chap. xx., before the ascension. That the evangelist did not think of relating *all* the appearances which he knew, is proved positively by that on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret, which is related after the close of the book (xx. 30, 31), and in an appendix (chap. xxi.) composed either by the author himself (at least as far as ver. 23) or based on a tradition emanating from him. He was therefore aware of this appearance, and he had not mentioned it in his Gospel, like Luke, who could not be ignorant of the appearance to the 500, and who has not mentioned it either in his Gospel or in Acts. What reserve should such facts impose on criticism, however little gifted with caution!—4. And the following must be very peculiarly borne in mind in judging of *Matthew's* narrative. It is no doubt strange to find this evangelist relating (besides the appearance to the women, which is intended merely to prepare for that following by the message which is given them) only a single appearance, that which took place on the mountain of Galilee, where Jesus had appointed His disciples, as well as the women and all the faithful, to meet Him, and where He gives the Eleven their commission. This appearance cannot be any of those which Luke and John place in Judæa. It comes nearer by its locality to that which, according to John xxi., took place in Galilee; but it cannot be identified with it, for the scene of the latter was the sea-shore. As we have seen, it can only be the appearance to the 500 mentioned by Paul. The meeting on a mountain is in perfect keeping with so numerous an assembly, though Matthew mentions none but the Eleven, because the grand aim is that mission of world-wide evangelization which Jesus gives them that day. Matthew's intention was not, as we have already seen, to mention *all* the different appearances, either in Judæa or Galilee, by which Jesus had re-awakened the personal faith of the apostles, and concluded His earthly connection with them. His narrative had exclusively in view that solemn appearance in which Jesus declared Himself the Lord of the universe, the sovereign of the nations, and had given the apostles their mission to conquer for Him the ends of the earth. So true is it that his narrative must terminate in this supreme fact, that Jesus announced it before His death (Matt. xxvi. 32), and that, immediately after the resurrection, the angel and Jesus Himself spoke of it to the women (xxviii. 7–10). Indeed, this scene was, in the view of the author of the first Gospel, the real goal of the theocratic revelation, the climax of the ancient covenant. If the day of the ascension was the most important in respect of the *personal development* of Jesus (Luke), the day of His

appearance on the mountain showed the accomplishment of the Messianic programme sketched i. 1: "Jesus, *the Christ*, the son of *David*, the son of *Abraham*." It was the decisive day for the establishment of the kingdom of God, which is Matthew's great thought. Criticism is on a false tack when it assumes that every evangelist has said all that he could have said. With oral tradition spread and received in the Church, the gospel historiography did not require to observe such an anxious gait as is supposed. It was not greatly concerned to relate an appearance more or less. The essential thing was to affirm the resurrection itself. The contrast between the detailed official enumeration of Paul, 1 Cor. xv., and each of our four Gospels, proves this to a demonstration. Especially does it seem to us thoroughly illogical to doubt the fact of the ascension, as Meyer does, because of Matthew's silence, and not to extend this doubt to all the appearances in Judæa, about which he is equally silent.

The following passage from the letter of Barnabas has sometimes been used in evidence: "We celebrate with joy that eighth day on which Jesus rose from the dead and, after having manifested Himself, ascended to heaven." The author, it is said, like Luke, places the ascension and the resurrection on the same day. But it may be that in this expression he puts them, not on the same day taken absolutely, but on the same day *of the week, the eighth*, Sunday (which no doubt would involve an error as to the ascension). Or, indeed, this saying may signify, according to John xx. 17, which in that case it would reproduce, that the ascending of Jesus to heaven began with the resurrection, and on that very day. In reality, from that time *He was no more with* His own, as He Himself says (Luke xxiv. 44). He belonged to a higher sphere of existence. He only *manifested Himself* here below. He no longer lived here. *He was ascending*, to use His own expression. According to this view, His resurrection and the beginning of His elevation (καὶ-καὶ) therefore took place the same day. The expression: *after having manifested Himself*, would refer to the appearances which took place on the resurrection day, and after which He entered into the celestial sphere.

In any case, the resurrection once admitted as a real fact, the question is, how Jesus left the earth. By stealth, without saying a word? One fine day, without any warning whatever, He ceased to re-appear? Is this mode of acting compatible with His tender love for His own? Or, indeed, according to M. de Bunsen, His body, exhausted by the last effort which His resurrection had cost Him (Jesus, according to this writer, was the author of this event by the energy of His will), succumbed in a missionary journey to Phenicia, where He went to seek believers among the Gentiles (John x. 17, 18; comp. with ver. 16); and having died there unknown, Jesus was likewise buried! But in this case, His body raised from the dead must have differed in no respect from the body which He had had during His life. And how are we to explain all the accounts, from which it appears that, between His resurrection and ascension, His

body was already under peculiar conditions, and in course of glorification?—The reality of such a fact as that related by Luke in his account of the ascension is therefore indubitable, both from the special standpoint of faith in the resurrection, and from the standpoint of faith in general. The ascension is a postulate of faith.

The ascension perfects in the person of the Son of man God's design in regard to humanity. To make of sanctified believers a family of children of God, perfectly like that only Son who is the prototype of the whole race,—such is God's plan, His eternal *πρόθεσις* (Rom. viii. 28, 29), with a view to which He created the universe. As the plant is the unconscious agent of the life of nature, man was intended to become the free and intelligent organ of the holy life of the personal God. Now, to realize this plan, God thought good (*εὐδόκησε*) to accomplish it first in ONE; Eph. ii. 6: "He hath raised us up IN CHRIST, and made us sit IN HIM in the heavenly places;" i. 10: "According to the purpose which He had to gather together all things under ONE head, Christ;" Heb. ii. 10: "Wishing to bring many sons to glory, He perfected THE CAPTAIN OF SALVATION." Such was, according to the divine plan, the first act of salvation. The second was to unite to this ONE individual believers, and thus to make them partakers of the divine state to which the Son of man had been raised (Rom. viii. 29). This assimilation of the faithful to His Son God accomplished by means of two things, which are the necessary complement of the facts of the Gospel history: Pentecost, whereby the Lord's moral being becomes that of the believer; and the Parousia, whereby the external condition of the sanctified believer is raised to the same elevation as that of our glorified Lord. First holiness, then glory, for the body as for the head: the baptism of Jesus, which becomes ours by Pentecost; the ascension of Jesus, which becomes ours by the Parousia.

Thus it is that each Gospel, and not only that which we have just been explaining, has the Acts for its second volume, and for its third the Apocalypse.

CONCLUSION.

FROM our exegetical studies we pass to the work of criticism, which will gather up the fruits. This will bear on four points:—

I. The characteristic features of our Gospel.

II. Its composition (aim, time, place, author).

III. Its sources, and its relation to the other two synoptics.

IV. The beginning of the Christian Church.

The first chapter will establish the facts; in the following two we shall ascend from these to their causes; the aim of the fourth is to replace the question of gospel literature in its historical position.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

WE have to characterize this writing—1*st.* As a historical production; 2*d.* As a religious work; 3*d.* As a literary composition.

I.—*Historical Point of View.*

The distinctive features of Luke's narrative, viewed historiographically, appear to us to be:—Fulness, accuracy, and continuity.

A. In respect of quantity, this Gospel far surpasses the other Syn. The entire matter contained in the three may be included in 172 sections.[1] Of this number, Luke has 127

[1] There is necessarily much arbitrariness in the way of marking off those sections, as well as in the way in which the parallelism between the three narratives is established, especially as concerns the discourses which are more or less

sections, that is to say, three-fourths of the whole, while Matthew presents only 114, or two-thirds, and Mark 84, or the half.

This superiority in fulness which distinguishes Luke will appear still more, if we observe that, after cutting off the fifty-six sections which are common to the three accounts, and form as it were the indivisible inheritance of the Syn., then the eighteen which are common to Luke and Matthew alone, finally the five which he has in common with Mark, there remain as his own peculiar portion, forty-eight—that is to say, more than a fourth of the whole materials, while Matthew has for his own only twenty-two, and Mark only five.

Once more, it is to be remarked that those materials which exclusively belong to Luke are as important as they are abundant. We have, for example, the narratives of the infancy; those of the raising of the son of the widow of Nain, of the woman who was a sinner at the feet of Jesus, of the entertainment at the house of Martha and Mary, of the tears of Jesus over Jerusalem; the parables of the good Samaritan, the lost sheep and the lost drachma, the prodigal son, the faithless steward, the wicked rich man, the unjust judge, the Pharisee and the publican; the prayer of Jesus for His executioners, His conversation with the thief on the cross, the appearance to the two disciples going to Emmaus, the ascension. How diminished would the portrait be which remains to us of Jesus, and what an impoverishment of the knowledge which we have of His teachings, if all these pieces, which are preserved by Luke alone, were wanting to us!

B. But, where history is concerned, abundance is of less importance than accuracy. Is the wealth of Luke of good quality, and does his treasure not contain base coin? We believe that all sound exegesis of Luke's narrative will result in paying homage to his fidelity. Are the parts in question those which are peculiar to him—the accounts of the

common to Matthew and Luke. M. Reuss (*Gesch. der heil. Schriften N. T.*), making the sections larger, obtains only 124. This difference may affect considerably the figures, which indicate the comparative fulness of the three Gospels.

infancy (chap. i. and ii.), the account of the journey (ix. 51–xix. 27), the view of the ascension (xxiv. 50–53)? We have found the first confirmed, so far as the central fact—the miraculous birth—is concerned, by the absolute holiness of Christ, which is the unwavering testimony of His consciousness, and which involves a different origin in His case from ours; and as to the details, by the purely Jewish character of the events and discourses,—a character which would be inexplicable after the rupture between the Church and the synagogue. The supernatural in these accounts has, besides, nothing in common with the legendary marvels of the apocryphal books, nor even with the already altered traditions which appear in such authors as Papias and Justin, the nearest successors of the apostles, on different points of the Gospel history. In studying carefully the account of the journey, we have found that all the improbabilities which are alleged against it vanish. It is not a straight journey to Jerusalem; it is a slow and solemn itineration, all the incidents and adventures of which Jesus turns to account, in order to educate His disciples and evangelize the multitudes. He thus finds the opportunity of visiting a country which till then had not enjoyed His ministry, the southern parts of Galilee, adjacent to Samaria, as well as Peræa. Thereby an important blank in His work in Israel is filled up. Finally, the sketch of that prolonged journey to Jerusalem, without presenting exactly the same type as John's narrative, which divides this epoch into four distinct journeys (to the feast of Tabernacles, chap. viii.; to the feast of Dedication, chap. x.; to Bethany, chap. xi.; to the last Passover, chap. xii.), yet resembles it so closely, that it is impossible not to take this circumstance as materially confirming Luke's account. It is a first, though imperfect, rectification of the abrupt contrast between the Galilean ministry and the last sojourn at Jerusalem which characterizes the synoptical view; it is the beginning of a return to the full historical truth restored by John.[1]

[1] Sabatier (*Essai sur les sources de la vie de Jésus*, pp. 31 and 32): "Luke, without seeking or intending it, but merely as the result of his new investigations, has destroyed the factitious framework of the synoptical tradition, and has given us a glimpse of a new one, larger, without being less simple. Luke is

We have found the account of the ascension not only confirmed by the apostolic view of the glorification of Jesus, which fills the epistles, by the last verses of Mark, and by the saying of Jesus, John vi. 62, but also by the express testimony of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 7, to an appearance granted to *all the apostles*, which must have taken place between that granted to the 500 brethren and that on the way to Damascus.

So far, then, from regarding those parts as arbitrary additions which Luke took the liberty of making to the Gospel history, we are bound to recognise them as real historical data, which serve to complete the beginning, middle, and end of our Lord's life.

We think we have also established the almost uniform accuracy shown by Luke in distributing, under a multitude of different occasions, discourses which are grouped by Matthew in one whole; we have recognised the same character of fidelity in the historical introductions which he almost always prefixes to those discourses. After having established, as we have done, the connection between the saying about the lilies of the field and the birds of the air and the parable of the foolish rich man (chap. xii.), the similar relation between the figures used in the lesson about prayer and the parable of the importunate friend (chap. xi.),—who will prefer, historically speaking, the place assigned by Matthew to those two lessons in the Sermon on the Mount, where the images used lose the exquisite fitness which in Luke they derive from their connection with the narratives preceding them? What judicious critic, after feeling the breach of continuity which is produced on the Sermon on the Mount by the insertion of the Lord's prayer (Matt. vi.), will not prefer the characteristic scene which Luke has described of the circumstances in which this form of prayer was taught to the apostles (Luke xi. 1 et seq.)? How can we doubt that the menacing farewell to the cities of Galilee was uttered at the time at which Luke has it (chap. x.), immediately after his departure, ix.

far from having cleared away every difficulty. . . . He had too much light to be satisfied with following in the track of his predecessors; he had not enough to reach the full reality of the Gospel history. He thus serves admirably to form the transition between the first two Gospels and the fourth."

51, rather than in the middle of the Galilean ministry, where it is put by Matthew? The same is true of the cases in which the sayings of Jesus can only be fully explained by the surroundings in which Luke places them; *e.g.*, the answers of Jesus to the three aspirants after the kingdom of God (chap. ix.) would be incomprehensible and hardly justifiable on the eve of a mere excursion to the other side of the sea (Matt. viii.), while they find their full explanation at the time of a final departure (Luke).

The introductions with which Luke prefaces those occasional teachings are not in favour with modern critics.[1] Yet Holtzmann acknowledges the historical truth of some,—of those, for example, which introduce the Lord's prayer and the lesson upon avarice (chap. xii.). We have ourselves established the accuracy of a very large number, and shown that they contain the key to the discourses which follow, and that commentators have often erred from having neglected the indications which they contain (see on xiii. 23, xiv. 25, xv. 1, 2, xvi. 1, 14, xvii. 20, xviii. 1, xix. 11). What confirms the really historical character of those notices is, that there is a certain number of doctrinal teachings which want them, and which Luke is satisfied to set down without connection and without introduction after one another: so with the four precepts, xvii. 1–10. Certainly, if he had allowed himself to invent situations, it would not have been more difficult to imagine them for those sayings than for so many others.

If, finally, we compare the parallel accounts of Luke and of the other two synoptics, we find, both in the description of facts and in the tenor of the sayings of Jesus, a very remarkable superiority on the part of Luke in respect of accuracy. We refer to the prayer of Jesus at the time of His baptism, and before His transfiguration—the human factor, as it is,

[1] Weizsäcker is the author who abuses them most:—"No value can be allowed to the historical introductions of Luke" (*Untersuch.* p. 139). It is true that he is necessarily led to this estimate by his opinion regarding the general conformity of the great discourses of Matthew to the common apostolic sources of Matthew and Luke, the *Logia*. If Matthew is, of the two evangelists, the one who faithfully reproduces this original, Luke must have arbitrarily dislocated the great bodies of discourse found in Matthew; and in this case, the historical introductions must be his own invention.

which leads to the divine interposition, and takes from it that abrupt character which it appears to have in the other accounts. In the temptation, the transposition of the last two acts of the struggle, in the transfiguration, the mention of the subject of the conversation of Jesus with Moses and Elias, throw great light on those scenes taken as a whole, which in the other synoptics are much less clear (see the passages).

We know that Luke is charged with grave historical errors. According to M. Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, p. xxxix. et seq.), certain declarations are "pushed to extremity and rendered false;" for example, xiv. 26, where Luke says: "If any man *hate* not his father and mother," where Matthew is content with saying: "He that *loveth* father or mother *more* than me." We refer to our exegesis of the passage. "He exaggerates the marvellous;" for example, the appearance of the angel in Gethsemane. As if Matthew and Mark did not relate a perfectly similar fact, which Luke omits, at the close of the account of the temptation! "He commits chronological errors;" for example, in regard to Quirinius and Lysanias. Luke appears to us right, so far as Lysanias is concerned; and as to Quirinius, considering the point at which researches now stand, an impartial historian will hardly take the liberty of condemning him unconditionally. According to Keim, Luke is evidently wrong in placing the visit to Nazareth at the opening of the Galilean ministry; but has he not given us previously the description of the general activity of Jesus in Galilee (iv. 14 and 15)? And is not the saying of ver. 23, which supposes a stay at Capernaum previous to this visit, to be thus explained? And, further, do not Matt. iv. 13 and John ii. 12 contain indisputable proofs of a return on the part of Jesus to Nazareth in the very earliest times of His Galilean ministry? According to the same author, Luke makes Nain in Galilee a city of Judæa; but this interpretation proceeds, as we have seen, from an entire misunderstanding of the context (see on vii. 17). It is alleged, on the ground of xvii. 11, that he did not know the relative positions of Samaria and Galilee. We are convinced that Luke is as far as possible from being guilty of so gross a mistake. According to M. Sabatier (p. 29), there is a contradiction

between the departure of Jesus by way of Samaria (ix. 52) and His arriving in Judæa by Jericho (xviii. 35); but even if the plan of Jesus had been to pass through Samaria, the refusal of the Samaritans to receive Him would have prevented Him from carrying it out. And had He, in spite of this, passed through Samaria, He might still have arrived by way of Jericho; for from the earliest times there has been a route from north to south on the right bank of the Jordan. Finally, he is charged with certain faults which he shares with the other two synoptics. But either those mistakes have no real existence, as that which refers to the day of Jesus' death, or Luke does not share them—*e.g.*, that which leads Matthew and Mark to place John's imprisonment before the first return of Jesus to Galilee, or the charge of inaccuracy attaches to him in a less degree than to his colleagues, as in the case of the omission of the journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem.

There is a last observation to be made on the historical character of Luke's narrative. It occupies an intermediate position between the other three Gospels. It has a point in common with Matthew—the doctrinal teachings of Jesus; it has also a point of contact with Mark—the sequence of the accounts, which is the same over a large portion of the narrative; it has likewise several features in common with John: the chief is, that considerable interval which in both of them divides the end of the Galilean ministry from the last sojourn at Jerusalem. Thereto must be added some special details, such as the visit to Martha and Mary, as well as the characteristics of those two women, which harmonize so well with the sketch of the family of Bethany drawn by John (ch. xi.); next, the dispute of the disciples at the close of the Holy Supper, with the lessons of Jesus therewith connected,—an account the connection of which with that of the feet-washing in John (chap. xiii.) is so striking. And thus, while remaining entirely independent of the other three, the Gospel of Luke is nevertheless confirmed and supported simultaneously by them all.

From all those facts established by exegesis, it follows that, if Luke's account has not, like that of John, the fulness and precision belonging to the narrative of an eye-witness, it nevertheless reaches the degree of fidelity which may

be attained by a historian who draws his materials from those sources which are at once the purest and the nearest to the facts.

C. An important confirmation of the accuracy of Luke's account arises from the continuity, the well-marked historical progression, which characterizes it. If he is behind John in this respect, he is far superior to Matthew and Mark.

Though the author did not tell us in his prologue, we should easily discover that his purpose is to depict the gradual development of the work of Christianity. He takes his starting-point at the earliest origin of this work—the announcement of the forerunner's birth; it is the first dawning of the new day which is rising on humanity. Then come the birth and growth of the forerunner — the birth and growth of Jesus Himself. The physical and moral development of Jesus is doubly sketched, before and after His first visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve; a scene related only by Luke, and which forms the link of connection between the infancy of Jesus and His public ministry. With the baptism begins the development of His work, the continuation of that of His person. From this point the narrative pursues two distinct and parallel lines: on one side, the progress of the new work; on the other, its violent rupture with the old work, Judaism. The progress of the work is marked by its external increase. At first, Capernaum is its centre; thence Jesus goes forth in all directions (iv. 43, 44): Nain to the west, Gergesa to the east, Bethsaïda-Julias to the north; then Capernaum ceases to be the centre of His excursions (viii. 1–3), and quitting those more northern countries entirely, He proceeds to evangelize southern Galilee and Peræa, upon which He had not yet entered (ix. 51), and repairs by this way to Jerusalem. Side by side with this external progress goes the moral development of the work itself. Surrounded at first by a certain number of *believers* (iv. 38–42), Jesus soon calls some of them to become His permanent *disciples* and fellow-labourers (v. 1–11, 27, 28). A considerable time after, when the work has grown, He chooses twelve from the midst of this multitude of disciples, making them His more immediate followers, and calling them *apostles.* Such is the foundation of the new edifice. The time at length comes when they are no longer

sufficient for the wants of the work. Then seventy new evangelists are added to them. The death of Jesus suspends for some time the progress of the work; but after His resurrection, the apostolate is reconstituted; and soon the ascension, by placing the Master on the throne, gives Him the means of elevating His fellow-labourers to the full height of that mission which they have to carry out in His name. Is not the concatenation of the narrative faultless? And is not this exposition far superior as a historical work to the systematic juxtaposition of homogeneous masses in Matthew, or to the series of anecdotes characteristic of Mark? The same gradation meets us in another line, that of the facts which mark the rupture between the new work and Israel with its official representatives. First it is the inhabitants of Nazareth, who refuse to recognise as the Messiah their former fellow-townsman (ch. iv.); afterwards it is the scribes who have come from Jerusalem, who deny His right to pardon sins, accuse Him of breaking the Sabbath (chap. v. and vi.), and, on seeing His miracles and hearing His answers, become almost mad with rage (vi. 11); it is Jesus who announces His near rejection by the Sanhedrim (ix. 22), and the death which awaits Him at Jerusalem (ver. 31); it is the woe pronounced on the cities of Galilee (chap. x.) and on that whole generation which shall one day be condemned by the queen of the south and the Ninevites; then we have the divine woe uttered at a feast face to face with the Pharisees and scribes, and the violent scene which follows this conflict (chap. xi. and xii.); the express announcement of the rejection of Israel and of the desolation of the country, especially of Jerusalem (chap. xiii.); the judgment and crucifixion of Jesus breaking the last link between Messiah and His people; the resurrection and ascension emancipating His person from all national connections, and completely spiritualizing His kingdom. Thus, in the end, the work begun at Bethlehem is traced to its climax, both in its internal development and its external emancipation.

It is with the view of exhibiting this steady progress of the divine work in the two respects indicated, that the author marks off his narrative from the beginning by a series of general remarks, which serve as resting-places by the way,

and which describe at each stage the present position of the work. These brief representations, which serve both as summaries and points of outlook, are always distinguished by the use of the descriptive tense (the imperfect); the resuming of the history is indicated by the reappearance of the narrative tense (the aor.). The following are the chief passages of this kind: i. 80, ii. 40, 52, iii. 18, iv. 15, 37, 44, v. 15, 16, viii. 1, ix. 51, xiii. 22, xvii. 11, xix. 28, 47, 48, xxi. 37, 38, xxiv. 53 (a last word, which closes the Gospel, and prepares for the narrative of the Acts). If those expressions are more and more distant in proportion as the narrative advances from the starting-point, it is because the further the journey proceeds, the less easy is it to measure its progress.

What completes the proof that this characteristic of continuity is not accidental in Luke's narrative, is the fact that exactly the same feature meets us in the book of Acts. Here Luke describes the birth and growth of the Church, precisely as he described in his Gospel the birth and growth of the person and work of Jesus. The narrative takes its course from Jerusalem to Antioch and from Antioch to Rome, as in the Gospel it proceeded from Bethlehem to Capernaum and from Capernaum to Jerusalem. And it is not only in the line of the progress of the work that the Acts continue the Gospel; it is also along that of the breach of the kingdom of God with the people of Israel. The rejection of the apostolic testimony and the persecution of the Twelve by the Sanhedrim; the rejection of Stephen's preaching, his martyrdom, and the dispersion of the Church which results from it; the martyrdom of James (chap. xii.); the uniform repetition of the contumacious conduct of Israel in every city of the world where Paul is careful to preach first in the synagogue; the machinations of the Jews against him on occasion of his arrest at Jerusalem, from which he escapes only by the impartial interposition of the Roman authorities; and finally, in the closing scene (chap. xxviii.), the decisive rejection of the Gospel by the Jewish community at Rome, the heart of the empire: such are the steps of that ever-growing separation between the Church and the synagogue, of which this last scene forms as it were the finishing stroke.

It is interesting to observe that the series of general

expressions which marks off the line of progress in the Gospel is continued in the Acts; it is the same course which is followed: i. 14, ii. 42–47, iv. 32–34, v. 12, 13, 42, vi. 7, viii. 4, 5, ix. 31, xii. 24, xiii. 52, xix. 20, xxiv. 26, 27, xxviii. 30, 31 (the last word, which is the conclusion of the narrative). The periodical recurrence of those expressions would suffice to prove that one and the same hand composed both the Gospel and the Acts; for this form is found nowhere else in the N. T.

By all those features, we recognise the superiority of Luke's narrative as a historical work. Matthew groups together doctrinal teachings in the form of great discourses; he is a preacher. Mark narrates events as they occur to his mind; he is a chronicler. Luke reproduces the external and internal development of the events; he is the historian properly so called. Let it be remarked that the three characteristics which we have observed in his narrative correspond exactly to the three main terms of his programme (i. 3): fulness, to the word πᾶσιν (*all things*); accuracy, to the word ἀκριβῶς (*exactly*); and continuity, to the word καθεξῆς (*in order*). It is therefore with a full consciousness of his method that Luke thus carried out his work. He traced a programme for himself, and followed it faithfully.

II.—*Religious Point of View.*

It is on this point that modern criticism has raised the most serious discussions. The Tübingen school, in particular, has endeavoured to prove that our third Gospel, instead of being composed purely and simply in the service of historical truth, was written in the interest of a particular tendency—that of the Christianity of Paul, which was entirely different from primitive and apostolic Christianity.

There is an unmistakeable affinity of a remarkable kind between the contents of Luke and what the Apostle Paul in his epistles frequently calls *his Gospel*, that is to say, the doctrine of the universality and entire freeness of the salvation offered to man without any legal condition. At the beginning, the angels celebrate the goodwill of God *to* (all) *men*. Simeon foreshadows the breach between the Messiah and the majority of His people. Luke alone follows out the

quotation of Isaiah relative to the ministry of John the Baptist, including the words: "And *all flesh* shall see the salvation of God." He traces the genealogy back to *Adam*. The ministry of Jesus opens with His visit to Nazareth, which forms an express prelude to the unbelief of Israel. The paralytic and the woman who was a sinner obtain pardon by *faith* alone. The sending of the seventy evangelists prefigures the evangelization of all nations. The part played by the Samaritan in the parable exhibits the superiority of that people's moral disposition to that of the Israelites. The four parables of the lost sheep and the lost drachma, the prodigal son, the Pharisee and the publican, are the doctrine of Paul exhibited in action. That of the marriage supper (chap. xiv.) adds to the calling of sinners in Israel (ver. 21) that of the Gentiles (vers. 22 and 23). The teaching regarding the unprofitable servant (xvii. 7-10) tears up the righteousness of works by the roots. The gratitude of the leprous Samaritan, compared with the ingratitude of the nine Jewish lepers, again exhibits the favourable disposition of this people, who are strangers to the theocracy. Salvation abides in the house of Zaccheus the publican from the moment he has believed. The form of the institution of the Holy Supper is almost identical with that of Paul, 1 Cor. xi. The sayings of Jesus on the cross related by Luke—His prayer for His executioners, His promise to the thief, and His last invocation to His Father—are all three words of grace and faith. The appearances of the risen Jesus correspond almost point for point to the enumeration of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. The command of Jesus to the apostles to "preach repentance and the remission of sins *to all nations*," is as it were the programme of that apostle's work; and the scene which closes the Gospel, that of Jesus leaving His own in the act of blessing them, admirably represents its spirit.

This assemblage of characteristic features belonging exclusively to Luke admits of no doubt that a special relation existed between the writing of this evangelist and the ministry of St. Paul; and that granted, we can hardly help finding a hint of this relation in the dedication addressed to Theophilus, no doubt a Christian moulded by Paul's teaching: "*That thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed*" (see vol. i. pp. 63, 64).

But this indisputable fact seems to be opposed by another not less evident—the presence in this same Gospel of a large number of elements wholly Jewish in their nature, or what is called at the present day the *Ebionism* of Luke.

This same historian, so partial to Paul's universalism, makes the new work begin in the sanctuary of the ancient covenant, in the holy place of the temple of Jerusalem. The persons called to take part in it are recommended to this divine privilege by their irreproachable fidelity to all legal observances (i. 6–15). The Messiah who is about to be born shall ascend the throne *of David His father;* His kingdom shall be the restored *house of Jacob* (vers. 32, 33); and the salvation which He will bring to His people shall have for its culminating point Israel's perfect celebration of worship freed from their enemies (vers. 74, 75). Jesus Himself is subject from the outset to all legal obligations; He is circumcised and presented in the temple on the days and with all the rites prescribed, and His parents do not return to their house, it is expressly said, "*till they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord.*" At the age indicated by theocratic custom, He is brought for the first time to the feast of Passover, where, according to the narrative, "*His parents went every year.*" As the condition of participating in the Messiah's kingdom, the people receive from the mouth of John the Baptist merely the appointment of certain works of righteousness and beneficence to be practised. If, in His ministry, Jesus has no scruple in violating the additions with which the doctors had surrounded the law as with a hedge,—for example, in His Sabbatic miracles,—He nevertheless remains subject to the Mosaic ordinance even in the matter of the Sabbath. He sends the healed leper to offer sacrifice at Jerusalem, *as a testimony* of His reverence for Moses. Eternal life consists, according to Him, in fulfilling the sum (x. 26–28) or the commandments of the law (xviii. 18–20). In the case of the woman whom He cures on the Sabbath day, He loves to assert her title as a *daughter of Abraham* (xiii. 16). He goes the length even of affirming (xvi. 17) that "*not one tittle of the law* shall fail." The true reason of that perdition which threatens the Pharisees, represented by the wicked rich man, is their not hearing *Moses and the prophets.*

Even at the very close of Jesus' ministry, the women who surround him, out of respect for the Sabbath, break off their preparations for embalming His body; "*and*, it is expressly said, *they rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment*" (xxiii. 56). Finally, it is Jerusalem which is to be the starting-point of the new preaching; it is in this city that the apostles are to wait for power from on high. It is in the temple that they abide continually, after the ascension. The narrative closes in the temple, as it was in the temple that it opened (xxiv. 53).

If Paul's conception is really *antinomian*, hostile to Judaism and the law, and if Luke wrote in the interest of this view, as is alleged by the Tübingen School, how are we to explain this second series of facts and doctrines, which is assuredly not less prominent in our Gospel than the first series? Criticism here finds itself in a difficulty, which is betrayed by the diversity of explanations which it seeks to give of this fact. Volkmar cuts the Gordian knot; according to him, those Jewish elements have no existence. The third Gospel is *purely* Pauline. That is easier to affirm than to demonstrate; he is the only one of his school who has dared to maintain this assertion, overthrown as it is by the most obvious facts. Baur acknowledges the facts, and explains them by admitting a later rehandling of our Gospel. The first composition, the primitive Luke, being exclusively Pauline, Ebionite elements were introduced later by the anonymous author of our canonical Luke, and that with a conciliatory view. But Zeller has perfectly proved to his master that this hypothesis of a primitive Luke different from ours, is incompatible with the unity of tendency and style which prevails in our Gospel, and which extends even to the second part of the work, the book of Acts. The Jewish elements are not *veneered* on the narrative; they belong to the substance of the history. And what explanation does Zeller himself propose? The author, personally a decided Paulinist, was convinced that, to get the system of his master admitted by the Judeo-Christian party, they must not be offended. He therefore thought it prudent to mix up in his treatise pieces of both classes, some Pauline, fitted to spread his own view; others Judaic, fitted to flatter the taste of readers till now

opposed to Paul's party. From this Machiavelian scheme the work of Luke proceeded, with its two radically contradictory currents.[1]

But before having recourse to an explanation so improbable both morally and rationally, as we shall find when we come to examine it more closely when treating of the aim of our Gospel, is it not fair to inquire whether there is not a more natural one, contrasting less offensively with that character of sincerity and simplicity which strikes every reader of Luke's narrative? Was not the Old Covenant with its legal forms the divinely-appointed preparation for the New? Was not the New with its pure spirituality the divinely-purposed goal of the Old? Had not Jeremiah already declared that the days were coming when God Himself would abolish the covenant which He had made at Sinai with the fathers of the nation, and when He would substitute a *New Covenant*, the essential character of which would be, that the law should be written no longer on tables of stone, but on the heart; no longer before us, but in us (xxxi. 31–34)? This promise clearly established the fact that the Messianic era would be at once the abolition of the law in the letter, and its eternal fulfilment in the spirit. And such is precisely the animating thought of the Gospel history, as it has been traced by Luke; his narrative depicts the gradual substitution of the dispensation of the spirit for that of the letter. The Mosaic economy is the starting-point of his history; Jesus Himself begins under its government; it is under this divine shelter that He grows, and His work matures. Then the spirituality of the Gospel is formed and gradually developed in His person and work, and getting rid by degrees of its temporary wrapping, ends by shining forth in all its brightness in the preaching and work of St. Paul. Mosaic economy and spirituality are not therefore, as criticism would have it, two opposite currents which run parallel or dash against one another in Luke's work. Between Ebionism

[1] Overbeck, another savant of the same school, in his commentary on the Acts (a re-edition of De Wette's), combats in his turn the theory of Zeller, and finds in the work of Luke the product, not of an ecclesiastical scheme, but of Paulinism in its decadence (see chap. ii. of this Conclusion). As to Keim, he has recourse to the hypothesis of an Ebionite Gospel, which was the first material on which Luke, the disciple of Paul, wrought (see chap. iii.). We see: *Tot capita, tot sensus.*

and Paulinism there is no more contradiction than between the blossom, under the protection of which the fruit forms, and that fruit itself, when it appears released from its rich covering. The substitution of fruit for flower is the result of an organic transformation; it is the very end of vegetation. Only the blossom does not fade away in a single day, any more than the fruit itself ripens in a single day. Jesus declares in Luke, that when new wine is offered to one accustomed to drink old wine, he turns away from it at once; for he says: *The old is better.* Agreeably to this principle, God does not deal abruptly with Israel; for this people, accustomed to the comparatively easy routine of ritualism, He provided a transition period intended to raise it gradually from legal servility to the perilous but glorious liberty of pure spirituality. This period is that of the development of Jesus Himself and of His work. The letter of the law was scrupulously respected, because the Spirit was not present to replace it; this admirable and divine work is what the Gospel of Luke invites us to contemplate: Jesus, as *a minister of the circumcision* (Rom. xv. 8), becoming the organ of the Spirit. And even after Pentecost, the Spirit still shows all needful deference to the letter of the divine law, and reaches its emancipation only in the way of rendering to it uniform homage; such is the scene set before us by the book of Acts in the conduct of the apostles, and especially in that of St. Paul. To explain therefore the two series of apparently heterogeneous pieces which we have indicated, we need neither Volkmar's audacious denial respecting the existence of one of them, nor the subtile hypothesis of two different Paulinisms in Luke, the one more, the other less hostile to Judeo-Christianity (Baur), nor the supposition of a shameless deception on the part of the forger who composed this writing (Zeller). It is as little necessary to ascribe to the author, with Overbeck, gross misunderstanding of the true system of his master Paul, or to allege, as Keim seems to do, that he clumsily placed in juxtaposition, and without being aware of it, two sorts of materials drawn from sources of opposite tendencies. All such explanations of a system driven to extremity vanish before the simple fact that the Ebionism and Paulinism of Luke belong both alike, as legitimate, necessary, successive elements, to the real history

of Jesus and His apostles,—the one as the inevitable point of departure, the other as the intended goal,—and that the period which separated the one point from the other served only to replace the one gradually by the other. By giving those two principles place with equal fulness in his narrative, Luke, far from guiding two contradictory tendencies immorally or unskilfully, has kept by the pure objectivity of history. Nothing proves this better than that very appearance of contradiction which he could brave, and which gives modern criticism so much to do.

Let it be remarked that the truth of the so-called Pauline elements in Luke's Gospel is fully borne out by the presence of similar elements in the other two synoptics. Ritschl, in his beautiful work on the beginnings of the ancient Catholic Church, shows how the one saying of Jesus, preserved in Mark and Matthew as well as in Luke: "*The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath,*" already implied the future abolition of the whole Mosaic law. The same is evidently true of the following (Matt. xv. and Mark vii.): "*Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth him.*" The whole Levitical law fell before this maxim logically carried out. We may also cite the saying, Matt. viii. 11: "*I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west; . . . but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out,*" though it is arbitrarily alleged that it was added later to the apostolic Matthew; then that which announces the substitution of the Gentiles for Israel, in the parable of the husbandmen: "*The kingdom shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof*" (xxi. 43), a saying which Matthew alone has preserved to us; finally, the command given to the apostles to go and baptize *all nations* (xxviii. 19), which necessarily belonged to the original Matthew: for, 1. The appearance with which it is connected is announced long before (Matt. xxvi. 32); 2. Because it is the only one related in this Gospel, and therefore could not be wanting in the original record; 3. Because Jesus certainly did not appear to His disciples to say nothing to them. But the most decisive saying related by our three synoptics is the parable of the old garment and the piece of new cloth (see on this passage, v. 36). Paul has affirmed

nothing more trenchant respecting the opposition between the law and the gospel.

The fundamental principles of Paulinism, the abolition of the law, the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles, are not therefore any importation of Paul or Luke into the gospel of Jesus. They belonged to the Master's teaching, though the time had not yet come for developing all their consequences practically.

This general question resolved, let us examine in detail the points which criticism still attempts to make good in regard to the subject under discussion. It is alleged that, under the influence of Paul's doctrine, Luke reaches a conception of the person of Christ which transcends that of the other two synoptics. "He softens the passages which had become embarrassing from the standpoint of a more exalted idea of the divinity of Jesus" (Renan); for example, he omits Matt. xxiv. 36, which ascribes the privilege of omniscience to the Father only. But did he do so intentionally? Was he acquainted with this saying? We have just seen another omission which he makes (p. 488); we shall meet with many more still, in which the proof of an opposite tendency might be quite as legitimately alleged. Is it not Luke who makes the centurion say, "Certainly this was a *righteous man*," while the other two represent him as saying, "This was the *Son of God*"? What a feeble basis for the edifice of criticism do such differences present!

The great journey across the countries situated between Galilee and Samaria was invented, according to Baur, with the view of bringing into relief the non-Israelitish country of Samaria. Luke thus sought to justify Paul's work among the Gentiles. But would Luke labour at the same moment to overthrow what he is building up, by inventing the refusal of the Samaritans to receive Jesus? Besides, it is wholly untrue that Samaria is the scene of the journey related in this part. Was it then in Samaria that Jesus conversed with a doctor of the law (x. 25), that He dined with a Pharisee, that He came into conflict with a company of scribes (xi. 37–53), that He cured in the synagogue a daughter of Abraham (xiii. 16), etc. etc.? There is found, no doubt, among the ten lepers one who is of Samaritan origin (xvii. 16); but if this

circumstance can lead us to suppose that the scene passes in Samaria, the presence of nine Jewish lepers should make it appear nine times more probable that it transpires on Israelitish territory.

In the instructions given to the Twelve, Luke omits the saying, "*Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not.*" Neither do we find the answer addressed to the Canaanitish woman, "*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*" But, as to the first, Mark omits it as well as Luke. Could this also arise from a dogmatic tendency? But how, in that case, should he relate the second as well as Matthew? The first then was simply wanting in his source; why not also in Luke's, which in this very narrative seems to have had the greatest conformity to that of Mark? As to the second saying, it belongs not only to a narrative, but to a whole cycle of narratives which is completely wanting in Luke (two whole chapters). Besides, does not Luke also omit the peculiarly Pauline saying, "*Come unto me, all ye who labour and are heavy laden, and ye shall find rest unto your souls*"? Could this also be a dogmatical omission? And as to the saying, "*This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached over all the earth,*" in connection with which, Holtzmann himself asks the Tübingen critics whether Luke passes it over in silence in a Pauline interest! Those declarations were simply wanting in his documents. Why not also those particularistic sayings? They would certainly not have caused Luke more embarrassment than they did to Matthew, who sees in them no contradiction to the command which closes his Gospel, "*Go and baptize all nations.*" It is evident that the prohibition addressed to the disciples (Matt. x.) was only temporary, and applied only to the time during which Jesus as a rule restricted His sphere of action to Israel; from the time that His death and resurrection released Him from His national surroundings, all was changed.

Luke has a grudge at the Twelve; he seeks to depreciate them: such is the thesis which Baur has maintained, and which has made way in France. He proves it by viii. 53, 54, where he contrives to make Luke say that *the disciples* laughed our Lord to scorn, and that He drove them from the

apartment; and yet the words, "*knowing that she was dead*," clearly prove that the persons here spoken of were those who had witnessed the death of the young girl; and ver. 51 excludes the view that He put the disciples out, for He had just brought them within the house (see the exegesis). He proves it further by ix. 32, where Luke says that Peter and the other two disciples were heavy with sleep; as if this remark were not intended to take off from the strangeness of Peter's saying which follows, and which is mentioned by the three evangelists. But the chief proof discovered by Baur of this hostile intention to the Twelve, is his account of the sending of the seventy disciples, and the way in which Luke applies to this mission a considerable part of the instructions given to the Twelve in Matt. x. But if the sending of the seventy disciples were an invention of Luke, after thus bringing them on the scene, he would make them play a part in the sequel of the Gospel history, and especially in the first Christian missions related in the Acts, while from that moment he says not a word more about them; the Twelve remain after, as well as before that mission, the only important persons; it is to them that Jesus gives the command to preach to the Gentiles (xxiv. 45 et seq.); it is from them that everything proceeds in the book of Acts; and when Philip and Stephen come on the scene, Luke does not designate them, as it would have been so easy for him to do, as having belonged to the number of the seventy. Keim himself acknowledges (p. 76) "that it is impossible to ascribe the invention of this history to Luke;" and in proof of this, he alleges the truly Jewish spirit of the saying with which Jesus receives the seventy on their return. So little was it suspected in the earliest times, even within the bosom of Judeo-Christian communities, that this narrative could be a Pauline invention, that it is frequently quoted in the *Clementine Homilies*. If, in narrating the sending of the Twelve, Luke did not quote all the instructions given by Matthew (chap. x.), the same omission takes place in Mark, who cannot, however, be suspected of any anti-apostolic tendency; this harmony proves that the omission is due to the sources of the two writers.

If Luke had the intention of depreciating the Twelve, would he alone describe the solemn act of their election? Would

he place it at the close of a whole night of prayer (chap. vi.)? Would he mention the glorious promise of Jesus to make the apostles sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel? Would he omit the assent which they all give in Matthew and Mark to the presumptuous declaration of Peter: *I am ready to go with Thee even unto death?* Would he make no mention of their shameful flight at Gethsemane, which is related by the other two? Would he excuse their sleeping on that last evening by saying that they were sleeping *for sorrow;* and their unbelief on the day of resurrection, by saying that it was *for joy* they could not believe (those details are peculiar to Luke)? Luke does not speak of the ambitious request of Zebedee's two sons, and of the altercation which ensued with the other disciples; he applies to the relation between the Jews and Gentiles that severe warning, the first part of which is addressed in Matthew to the Twelve: *"and there are first which shall be last,"* and the second part of which: *"and there are last which shall be first,"* might so easily have been turned to the honour of Paul. If there is one of the synoptics who holds up to view the misunderstandings and moral defects of the apostles, and the frequent displeasure of Jesus with them, it is Mark, and not Luke.

In respect to Peter, who it is alleged is peculiarly the object of Luke's antipathy, this evangelist certainly omits the saying so honouring to this apostle: *"Thou art Peter,"* etc., as well as the narrative, Matt. xiv. 28–31, in which Peter is privileged to walk on the waters by the side of our Lord. But he also omits in the former case that terrible rebuke which immediately follows: *"Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me."* And what is the entire omission of this whole scene, compared with the conduct of Mark, who omits the first part favourable to Peter, and relates in detail the second, where he is so sternly reprimanded! If it was honouring to Peter to walk on the waters, it was not very much so to sink the next moment, and to bring down on himself the apostrophe: *"O thou of little faith!"* The omission of this incident has therefore nothing suspicious about it. Is not the history of Peter's call related in Luke (chap. v.) in a way still more glorious for him than in Matthew and Mark? Is he not presented, from beginning to end of this narrative, as the

principal person, in a sense the only one (vers. 4, 10)? Is it not he again who, in the first days of Jesus' ministry at Capernaum, plays the essential part (Luke iv. 38–44)? On the eve of the death of Jesus, is it not he who is honoured, along with John, with the mission of making ready the Passover, and that in Luke only? Is not his denial related in Luke with much more reserve than in Matthew, where the imprecations of Peter upon himself are expressly mentioned? Is it not in Luke that Jesus declares that He has devoted to Peter a special prayer, and expects from him the strengthening of all the other disciples (xxii. 32)? Is he not the first of the apostles to whom, according to Luke (xxiii. 34) as according to Paul (1 Cor. xv.), the risen Jesus appears? And despite all this, men dare to represent the third Gospel as a satire directed against the Twelve, and against Peter in particular (the anonymous Saxon);[1] and M. Burnouf ventures to characterize it thus in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (December 1865): "Luke seeks to attenuate the authority of the Twelve . . .; he depreciates Peter; he takes from the Twelve the merit of having founded the religion of Christ, by adding to them seventy envoys whose mission is contrary to the most authoritative Israelitish usages." M. Burnouf forgets to tell us what those usages are, and whether Jesus held Himself always strictly bound to Jewish usages. On the other hand, Zeller, the pronounced disciple of Baur, finds himself obliged to make this confession (*Apostelgesch.* p. 450): "We cannot suppose in the case of Luke any real hostility to the Twelve, because he mentions circumstances omitted by Matthew himself which exalt them, and because he omits others which are to their discredit."

Once more, in what is called the Jewish tendency of Luke, there is a point which has engaged the attention of criticism; we mean the partiality expressed by this Gospel for the poorer classes, its *Ebionism* (strictly so called)![2] "Luke's heresy," as De Wette has it. It appears i. 53, vi. 20, 21, where the

[1] Zeller himself says (*Apostelgesch.* p. 436): "In reality, there are not to be found in this Gospel any of the indirect attacks, insults, malevolent insinuations and sarcasms against Judeo-Christianity and the Judeo-Christian apostles which the anonymous Saxon seeks in it."

[2] It is well known that this term arises from a Hebrew word signifying *poor*.

poor appear to be saved, the rich condemned, *as such;* xii. 33, 34, xvi. 9, 23–25, xviii. 22–25, where salvation is connected with almsgiving and the sacrifice of earthly goods, damnation with the keeping of them. But: 1. We have seen that there is a temporary side in these precepts; see especially on xii. 33, 34, xviii. 22–25. Does not Paul also (1 Cor. vii.) recommend to Christians not to possess, but "*to possess* as though they possessed not"? 2. Poverty and riches by no means produce those effects inevitably and without the concurrence of the will. Poverty does not save; it prepares for salvation, by producing lowliness: wealth does not condemn; it may lead to damnation, by hardening the heart and producing forgetfulness of God and His law: such is the meaning of vi. 21–25 when rightly understood; of xvi. 29–31; of xviii. 27 (the salvation of the rich impossible with men, but *possible with God*); finally, of Acts v. 4, where the right of property in the case of Ananias and Sapphira is expressly reserved by Peter, and their punishment founded solely on their falsehood. 3. The alleged "heresy of Luke" is also that of Matthew and Mark (narrative of the rich young man), and consequently of our Lord Himself. Let us rather recognise that the giving up of property appears in the teaching of Jesus, either as a measure arising from the necessity imposed on His disciples of accompanying Him outwardly, or as a voluntary and optional offering of charity, applicable to all times.

If now, setting aside critical discussion, we seek positively to characterize the religious complexion of Luke's narrative, the fundamental tone appears to us to be, as Lange says (*Leben Jesu*, i. p. 258 et seq.): "the revelation of divine mercy," or, better still, according to Paul's literal expression (Tit. iii. 4): *the manifestation of divine philanthropy.*

To this characteristic there is a second corresponding one: Luke loves to exhibit in the human soul, in the very midst of its fallen state, the presence of some ray of the divine image. He speaks of that *honest and good heart*, which receives the seed of the gospel as soon as it is scattered on it; he points to the good Samaritan performing instinctively *the things contained in the law* (Rom. ii. 14); in the case of Zaccheus he indicates the manifestation of natural probity and beneficence, as he will do in the book of Acts, in respect to

Cornelius and several others, especially some of the Roman magistrates with whom Paul has to do. Therein we recognise the Greek ideal of the καλὸς κἀγαθός.

With the first of those two characteristics there is undoubtedly connected that universalism of grace so often pointed out in Luke; with the second, perhaps, the essential character which he unfolds in the person of Christ: humanity working out in Him its pure and normal development; the child, the young man growing in grace and wisdom as He grows in stature; the man comes out in His emotion at the sight of a mother bereaved of her son, of His native country on the eve of ruin, of His executioners who are striking themselves while they strike Him, of a thief who humbles himself. We understand the whole: it is *the Son of man*, born an infant, but through all the stages of life and death, *becoming* the High Priest of His brethren, whom He leaves in the act of blessing them. So that this history is summed up in two features: divine compassion stooping down to man; human aspirations entering into perfect union with God in the person of Him who is to bring back all others to God.

With such a history before us, what narrow unworthy particularistic tendency could possibly exist in the writer who understood and worked upon it? Such an object imposes objectivity on the historian.[1]

III.—*Literary Point of View.*

A. The first feature which distinguishes Luke's work in this respect is the presence of a *prologue*, written in a Greek style of perfect purity, and in which the author gives account of the origin of his book. We have already shown (vol. i. p. 53) what is the necessary inference from this fact, which has no analogy either in Matthew or Mark, or even in John, and

[1] This conclusion is admitted by two of the most distinguished representatives of modern criticism. Holtzmann (p. 401): "Just as the most ancient demonstrable Gospel document, the *Logia*, was written without the least regard to any dogmatic interest . . ., so the third Gospel, the most extensive work of the synoptic literature, betrays the tendency of its author only in its arrangement and choice of materials, and in slight modifications which bear only on the form of delineation." Reuss (sec. 209): "We shall be nearer the truth if we assert that it was in no party interest, but by means of a disinterested historical investigation, that the materials of this narrative were collected."

which would suffice to demonstrate the Hellenic origin of the author, and the high degree of classical culture which prevailed in the circle, with a view to which he wrote.

B. The chief question which has been raised in regard to the literary character of Luke's composition is whether it belongs to the class of *collectanea*, simple compilations, or whether in all its details it observes a consecutive *plan*. It is well known that Schleiermacher took the first view. Our Gospel is in his eyes an aggregate of pieces separately composed and put together by a later compiler. In Ewald's opinion also the author is only a collector. Holtzmann himself (article on the Acts, in the *Bible Dictionary* published by Schenkel) calls our Gospel "a compilation without any well-defined plan;" he extends the same judgment to the Acts. This opinion is combated by several critics. Hilgenfeld speaks of "the artistic unity" of Luke's narrative. Zeller acknowledges "that a rigorous plan prevails throughout the entire work" (Gospel and Acts). M. Renan sees in it "a work written throughout by the same hand, and with the most perfect unity." We adhere fully to this second view. We have already pointed out that one single idea inspires the whole narrative, and has determined the choice of its materials, namely, that of the development of the Christian work (i. 1), from the twofold standpoint of its organic growth and of its breach with the Israelitish people. Once in possession of this idea, we easily comprehend the course of the narrative. The first two chapters of the Gospel are an introduction, in which Luke gives the preparation for the new work in that pure Being placed by God in the bosom of humanity. The work itself begins with the baptism of Jesus in chap. iii. It comprises three parts: 1. The Galilean ministry; Jesus draws to Him the elements of His future Church, and lays down in the apostolate the principle of its organization. 2. The journey from Galilee to Judea; this is a transition period: the work extends outwardly while it is strengthened spiritually; but the hostility of the official representatives of the nation, the scribes and Pharisees, lighted up already in the previous period, goes on increasing. 3. The sojourn at Jerusalem: the cross violently breaks the last link between Israel and its King. But the resurrection and ascension, freeing Jesus from

every national relation, and raising Him to a free and glorious existence, suited to the nature of the Son of God (Rom. i. 3, 4), make Him, in the words of Peter, *the Lord of all* (Acts x. 36). The Israelitish Messiah by birth, He becomes by His death and ascension the King of the universe. From that time forth His people is the human race. The ascension, which forms the climax of the Gospel history, is at the same time the starting-point for the history of the Acts. "On the one side, we ascend to this summit; on the other, we descend from it."[1] Hence the double narration of the fact. It belongs, indeed, to both writings,—to the one as its crown, to the other as its basis. This repetition does not arise, as a superficial criticism supposes, from the juxtaposition of two different traditions regarding that event.[2] What sensible writer would adopt such a course? The ascension is the bond which joins together the two aspects of the divine work, —that in which Jesus rises from the manger to the throne, and that in which, from the throne on high, He acts upon humanity, creating, preserving, and extending the Church. It forms part of the history of Jesus and of that of the Church.

Between the work which is wrought in Jesus and that wrought in the Church, and which is described in Acts, there is a correspondence which is exhibited by the parallelism of plan in the two books. After an introduction which describes the community of believers as already formed, though yet unknown (Acts i., comp. with Luke i. and ii.), Pentecost introduces it on the theatre of history, as His baptism called Jesus to His public activity. 1. Here begins, chap. ii., the first part of the narrative, which extends to the end of chap. v.; it relates, first, the founding of the church of Jerusalem, the mother and model of all others; then the obstinate resistance which the preaching of the apostles met with from the Jewish authorities and the mass of the nation. 2. The second part, perhaps the most remarkable in many respects, delineates, like the second part of the Gospel, a transition period. It extends

[1] M. Félix Bovet.

[2] Any more than in the case of the double narrative of the creation of man in Genesis (chap. i. and ii.). Man is described, chap. i., as the goal of the development of nature; chap. ii., as the basis of the development of history. Nature rises to him; history goes forth from him.

to the end of chap. xii. The author has collected and enumerated in this piece the whole series of providential events by which the way was paved for transferring the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles, the subject of the third part. First, there is the ministry of Stephen, who dies for having said "*that Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy the temple, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered*" (vi. 14). There is the ministry of Philip (chap. viii.), who makes the first breach on the Gentile world by the conversion of the Samaritans, in which Peter and John themselves come to take part. There is, by the hand of the same Philip, the baptism of a man who was doubly excluded from the ancient covenant as a Gentile and as a eunuch (Deut. xxiii. 1). There is the conversion of Saul, who is to be the principal instrument of the work about to begin, the persecutor but the successor of Stephen. There is through the ministry of Peter the baptism of the Gentile Cornelius and his family, in consequence of the vision by which God taught that apostle that the wall of separation raised by the law between Israel and the Gentiles was thenceforth broken down. There is, as an effect of the dispersion of the church of Jerusalem, the foundation of the church of Antioch, the first church of heathendom, the point from which Paul will take his course to the heathen world, his permanent basis of operations, the Jerusalem of the Gentile world. Those six events, apparently accidental, but all converging to the same end, are chosen and grouped by the author with incomparable skill, to show, as it were, to the eye the ways in which the divine wisdom prepared for the approaching work, the conversion of heathendom. Chap. xii. concludes this part. It relates the martyrdom of James, the attempted martyrdom of Peter, and the sudden death of their persecutor, the last great representative of the Jewish nation, Herod Agrippa—persecuting Israel struck dead in the person of its last monarch. 3. The third part relates the foundation of the Church among the Gentiles by St. Paul's three journeys. His imprisonment at Jerusalem at the close of those three missionary tours, and the surrounding circumstances, form a sort of counterpart to the story of the Passion in the Gospel. It is the last act in the rejection of the Gospel by Israel, to which the conduct of the elders of the Roman synagogue

toward Paul (chap. xxviii.) puts the finishing stroke. What could be grander or clearer than this plan? We have yet to wait for a history of the Reformation, giving us, within the space of a hundred pages, as complete and precise a view of that great religious revolution as that which Luke has left us in the Acts, of the yet profounder revolution by which God transferred His kingdom from the Jews to the Gentiles.

C. If the plan of Luke is admirable from the controlling unity to which he subordinates so great a variety of materials, the *style* of the Gospel and of the Acts presents a similar phenomenon. On the one hand it is a striking medley. To the prologue of classic Greek, classic both in construction and vocabulary, there succeed narratives of the infancy, written in a style which is rather a *décalque*[1] from the Aramaic than true Greek. It is quite clear that the author, after writing the prologue in his own style, here uses an Aramaic document or a translation from the Aramaic. We shall not repeat the proofs of this fact which we have given in our exegesis; in a measure they extend to the whole Gospel. As to the question whether it is Luke himself who has translated it into Greek, or whether he used a record already translated, we shall answer it immediately. For the present, we repeat that the proof which Bleek finds to support the second view in the expression ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, i. 78, is without the least value (see the exegesis). Finally, besides the prologue written in pure Greek, and the parts which follow, all saturated with Aramaisms, we find other parts, such as chap. xiv. 7–xv. 32, xxii., xxiii., the Hebrew colouring of which is much less pronounced, and which presented nothing or almost nothing offensive to Greek ears. It is not probable that they proceed from an Aramaic document, any more than that Luke composed them freely. In the first case they would contain more Hebraisms; in the second, they would be still more completely free from them. It is therefore probable that those passages were composed in Greek by Luke or his predecessor, not from an Aramaic document, but from an oral tradition in that language.

The same variety of style reappears in the Acts. The first

[1] The name for the copy of a picture traced on transparent paper placed over the original.—Tr.

parts of this book betray an Aramaic source in every line. This character gradually disappears, and the last parts of the book, in which the author relates the scenes in which he seems to have been personally present, are written in as pure Greek as the prologue of the Gospel.

On the other hand, and notwithstanding this medley, the style of Luke has in many respects the seal of a well-marked unity. Not only is his vocabulary everywhere more extensive than that of the other evangelists, as might be expected from a writer familiar with classic Greek; for example, he displays in a far higher degree the facility with which the Greek language indefinitely multiplies its stock of verbs, by compounding the simple ones with prepositions and otherwise; but he has also certain expressions which exclusively belong to him, or which he uses with marked predilection, and which are scattered uniformly over all parts of his two writings, even those which are most evidently translated from the Aramaic. And this is the proof that Luke in those pieces did not make use of a translation already made, but was himself the translator.[1]

There are also certain correspondences alleged in vocabulary and syntax between Luke's style and that of Paul. Holtzmann enumerates about 200 expressions or phrases common to those two authors, and more or less foreign to all the other N. T. writers.[2] The anonymous Saxon has taken advantage of this fact in support of his hypothesis, according to which Paul himself was the author of the third Gospel. But this proof is far from satisfactory; the phenomenon is explained, on the one hand, by the fact that Paul and Luke are the only two writers of the N. T. who

[1] Zeller has devoted two profound essays to this element exclusively belonging to Luke in his two narratives, the one in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1843, p. 467 et seq., the other in his *Apostelgesch.* p. 390 et seq. He enumerates 139 expressions used preferentially, and 134 terms and phrases used exclusively, or almost exclusively, by Luke in the two works. The following are examples selected at random: *συμβάλλειν, περιλάμπειν*, and others like them; *ἀνάληψις, ὁ ὕψιστος, ἔμφοβος, ἔντρομος, παραχρῆμα, ἐξῆς, καθεξῆς, ἱκανόν*, etc.; *καὶ αὐτός, δὲ καί* (gradation), *τοῦτο ὅτι, τί ὅτι, τό* before a proposition which serves as a substantive, *καθότι, μὲν οὖν, καὶ γάρ, ἰδοὺ γάρ, ἔλεγε δέ* (in the sense so often pointed out in our commentary), *ἐπ' ἀληθείας, ἐξ ἧς ἡμέρας, κατὰ ἔθος* or *τὸ εἰωθός*, or *τὸ εἰθισμένον*, etc.

[2] For example: *ἀνθ' ὧν, ἀλλ' οὐδέ, ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, ἐκκακεῖν, παράδεισος, ἀσώτως, ἀναπόδομα, αἰνεῖν τὸν θεόν, ἀστενίζειν, διαγγέλλειν, ἀστηρίζειν*, etc.

were educated amid classical surroundings; on the other, by the personal relations which they kept up so long with one another; at least, if we are to trust the tradition which ascribes the Gospel to Luke (see chap. ii. of this Conclusion).

The study which we have now made of the distinctive characteristics of Luke's Gospel supplies us with the necessary data for reaching the conclusions for which we have to inquire regarding the origin of this composition.

CHAPTER II.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

We have before us in this chapter the four following points: The *aim* of the Gospel, the *time* of its composition, the *author* to whom it is to be ascribed, the *place* where he composed it.

I.—*The Aim.*

The common aim of our Gospels is to produce faith in Him whom they describe as the Saviour of the world. But each of them pursues this aim in a particular way: Matthew, by bringing the history of our Lord into connection with the Messianic prophecies of which it is the fulfilment; Mark, by seeking to reproduce the unique splendour which rayed forth from His person; John, by relating the most salient testimonies and facts which led His disciples to recognise and adore Him as the Son of God. What is the means by which Luke wishes to gain the same end?

It was thought enough, even down to our own day, to answer that he had sought to trace the Gospel history as faithfully as possible with a view to believers among the Gentiles.[1] This solution is not precise enough for the authors of the critical school, which seeks party tendencies everywhere in our sacred writings. By combining with the study of the

[1] So Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25), Eichhorn, Schleiermacher, De Wette, Bleek, stop short at this general definition. From this point of view, the Acts are simply regarded as a history of the apostolic age or of the first missions.

Gospel that of the Acts, the objects of which seemed more pronounced, they have come to the conclusion that the writings of Luke are nothing else than a disguised defence of the person and preaching of Paul, in opposition to the persons and teaching of the Twelve; a history more or less fictitious, intended to gain favour for that apostle with the Judeo-Christian party which, down to the second century, remained obstinately hostile to him. Zeller, in particular, has developed this thesis in a work which might be called classic, if erudition and sagacity could stand for justice and impartiality.[1] MM. Reuss (§ 210) and Nicolas (p. 268) also ascribe to the Acts the aim of reconciling the Judeo-Christian and Pauline parties, but without accusing the author of wilfully altering the facts.[2]

It must indeed be confessed, especially if we take account of the narrative of the Acts, that it is very difficult to believe that in writing this history the author had only the general intention of giving as complete and faithful a view of the facts as possible. A more particular aim seems to show itself in the choice of the materials which he uses, as well as in the numerous omissions which he makes. Whence comes it that, of all the apostles, Peter and Paul are the only ones brought on the scene? How are we to explain the marvellous parallelism between them established by the narrative? Whence the predilection of the author for everything relating to the person of the latter; the thrice repeated narrative of his conversion, the detailed account of the varied phases of his trial, the peculiarly marked notice of his relations to the Roman magistrates? Why relate in detail the founding of the churches of Greece, and not devote a line to that of so important a church as Alexandria (to which Paul remained a stranger)? To what purpose the circumstantial recital of Paul's voyage to Rome? And why does the account of his arrival close the book so abruptly? Is not Overbeck right

[1] Zeller (p. 363) calls the book of Acts "a treaty of peace proposed to the Judeo-Christians by a Paulinist, who wishes to purchase from them the acknowledgment of Gentile Christianity by a series of concessions made to Judaism."

[2] M. Nicolas thus expresses the aim of the Acts: "To extinguish the discussions of the two parties, and lead them to forget their old feuds by showing them that their founders . . . had laboured with a full understanding with one another for the propagation of Christianity."

in saying that, in reality, "the subject of the book is not the gospel, but the gospel *preached by Paul.*" Even the first part, that which relates to Peter, seems to be only a preparation for the account of Paul's ministry. The author seems to say: Great as Peter was in his work in Israel, Paul was not one whit behind him in his among the Gentiles; the extraordinary miracles and successes by which God accredited the former were repeated in no less a measure in the case of the other.[1]

We do not think that the recent defenders of the historical trustworthiness of the Gospel and the Acts (Mayerhoff, Baumgarten, Lekebusch) have succeeded altogether in parrying this blow. They have attempted to explain part of those facts, while admitting that the theme of the Acts was solely the propagation of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome; but this very demonstration breaks down at several points, and especially in the last chapter. For when Paul reaches this capital it is not he who brings the gospel to it; rather it is the gospel which receives him there (xxviii. 15); and in what follows, the founding of a church at Rome by Paul is not related. As Overbeck says, "The Acts relate, not how the *gospel,* but how *Paul,* reached Rome."

While fully recognising that the purely historical aim is unsatisfactory, it seems to us that that which Zeller proposes is inadmissible. Not only, as Bleek observes, must the coldly calculated deception, which would be inevitable in an author inventing a narrative with the view of forging history, appear absolutely improbable to every reader who gives himself up to the impression which so simple a composition produces; but besides, how are we to set before our minds the result proposed to be gained in this way? Did the author mean, asks Overbeck, to influence the Judeo-Christians to unite with Paul's party? But in that case it was a most unskilful expedient to set before them the conduct of the Jewish nation in the odious light in which it appears throughout the entire history of the Acts, from the persecutions against the apostles in the first chap-

[1] It is known that Schneckenburger regarded this parallel between Peter and Paul as the principal thought and aim of the Acts (without thinking that the truth of the narrative was thereby compromised). It is only as a *curiosum* that we refer to the opinion of Aberlé, who regards the Acts as a memoir prepared with a view to Paul's defence in his trial before the imperial tribunal.

ters, down to the dark plots in which the Sanhedrim itself does not shrink from taking part against the life of St. Paul. It must then be by acting on his own party, the Paulinists, that the author hoped to effect the fusion of the two camps. By presenting the picture of the harmony between Paul and the Twelve at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), he proposed to bring the Paulinists of his time to concede to the Judeo-Christians, as Paul had formerly done to the apostles, the observance of the Mosaic rites. But the Judeo-Christians themselves of that period no longer held to this concession. It appears from the *Clementine Homilies* that circumcision was abandoned by this party. The author of the Acts, a zealous Paulinist, must then have asked his own to yield to their adversaries more than the latter themselves required! Finally, what purpose, on Zeller's supposition, would be served by the entire transition part (chap. vi.–xii.)? This elaborate enumeration of the circumstances which went to pave the way for the free evangelization of the Gentile world might and should have its place in a truthful and sincere narrative of the progress of the Christian work; it was a digression in a romance intended to raise Paul to the level of Peter. The modified form given by MM. Reuss and Nicolas to this conciliation-hypothesis has no force unless there is ascribed to the apostolic Judeo-Christianity and Paulinism a meaning and importance which, in our opinion, it never had (see chap. iv.). What hypothesis does Overbeck substitute for that of Zeller, which he so well combats? According to this critic, the author of the Acts does not think of reconciling the two camps. It is the Pauline party alone which, working on its own account, here attempts by the pen of one of its members "to come to an understanding with its past, its peculiar origin, and its first founder, Paul" (p. xxi.). Such, after so much beating about, is the last word of Baur's School on the aim of the writings of Luke. It is on the face of it a somewhat strange idea, that of a party composing a historical book *to come to a clear understanding* with its past. It is not, however, inconceivable. But if the author really means to come to an understanding about the beginnings of his party, it is because he knows those beginnings, and believes in them. The past is to him a definite quantity by which he measures the

present. But in that case, how are we to explain the wilful falsifications of history in which, according to Overbeck himself, he indulged? The miracles of St. Peter in the first part of the Acts are set down to the account of legend; but those of Paul, in the second, were knowingly invented by the author. To restore the past at one's own caprice, is that to come to a clear understanding with it? Much more, the author of the Acts, not content with peopling the night of the past with imaginary events, went the length of putting himself "into systematic opposition" (p. xxxvi.) to what Paul says of himself in his epistles. To contradict systematically, that is to say, knowingly, the best authenticated documents proceeding from the founder of the party,—such is the way "to come to light regarding the person of that chief"! The Tübingen criticism has entangled itself in a *cul-de-sac* from which it cannot escape except by renouncing its first error, the opposition between the principles of Paul and those of the Twelve. We shall return to this question in our last chapter.

The reperusal of the third Gospel is enough to convince any one that its author seriously pursues a historical aim. This appears from the numerous chronological, geographical, and other like notices of which his work is full (Quirinius, ii. 2; the cycle of dates, iii. 1; the age of Jesus, v. 23; the second-first Sabbath, vi. 1; the details regarding the material support of Jesus and His apostles, viii. 1–3; compare also ix. 51, xiii. 22, xvii. 11, xxi. 37, 38, etc.). The narrative of the Acts is everywhere strewn with similar remarks (on Bethany, i. 12; expulsion of the Jews by Claudius, xviii. 2; Gallio, v. 12; the money value of the books burned, xix. 19; the details of the disturbance at Ephesus, chap. xix.; the fifty days between Passover and Pentecost, of which the narrative of the journey enables us to give an exact account, xx. 6–xxi. 16; the number of soldiers, cavalry and infantry, forming the escort, xxiii. 23; the circumstantial account of the shipwreck, xxvii.; the nationality and figurehead of the vessel which carries Paul to Rome, xxviii. 11). The historical purpose of the narrative appears from the programme marked out in the prologue: to relate *all things, from the very first, in order, exactly* (i. 3).

Yet it is certain, on the other hand, that no more than the

other evangelists does the author relate history merely as history,—that is to say, to interest the reader and satisfy his curiosity. He evidently proposes to himself a more exalted aim. The tone of his narrative proves this, and he tells us so himself. He has before his eyes a reader who is already abreast of the essential points of the gospel verity, and whom he wishes to furnish with the means of confirming the reality of the object of his faith (*τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*). It is with this view that he presents him with a full, exact, and consecutive description of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ, "*that he might* [thus himself] *verify the infallible certainty of those things wherein he has been instructed.*"

In what did those instructions received by Theophilus consist? According to St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 3–5), the essential points of elementary instruction were these two: Christ *dead for our sins, and risen the third day.* In Rom. x. 6–10 the same apostle thus defines the object of faith, and the contents of the Christian profession: Christ descended for us into the abyss, and ascended for us to heaven; comp. also Rom. iv. 23–25. Such is likewise the summary of Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost.

Nevertheless, at the house of Cornelius (Acts x.), Peter already feels the need of preparing for the proclamation of those decisive saving truths by a rapid sketch of the ministry of Jesus. At Antioch of Pisidia (Acts xiii. 23, 24), Paul goes back, like Peter, even to the ministry of John the Baptist. For there is in the mind of every man, face to face with an important historical event, the felt need not merely to account for what it contains, but also for the way in which it has come about. And when the event has exercised, and continues ever to exercise, a deep influence on the lot of humanity, and on that of every individual, then the need of knowing its beginnings and development, its *genesis*, if I may so speak, takes forcible possession of every serious mind. And this desire is legitimate. The more value the event has, the more important is it for the conscience to defend itself from every illusion in regard to it. Such must have been the position of a large number of believing and cultured Greeks, of whom Theophilus was the representative. What mysteries must have appeared to such minds in those unheard of events

which form the goal of gospel history: a man dying for the salvation of all other men; a Jew raised to the condition of the Son of God, and to power over all things; and that especially when those events were presented apart from their connection with those which had preceded and prepared for them, having all the appearance of abrupt manifestations from heaven! To how many objections must such doctrine have given rise? It is not without reason that St. Paul speaks of the cross as: *to the Greeks foolishness.* Was it not important to supply a point of support for such instructions, and in order to do that, to settle them on the solid basis of facts? To relate in detail the beginning and middle of this history, was not this to render the end of it more worthy of faith? In dealing with such men as Theophilus, there was an urgent necessity for supplying history as the basis of their catechetical training.

No one could understand better than St. Paul the need for such a work, and we should not be surprised though it were to him that the initiative was due. It is true there existed already a considerable number of accounts of the ministry of Jesus; but according to i. 3 (explained in contrast with vers. 1, 2), those works were only collections of anecdotes put together without connection and without criticism. Such compilations could not suffice to meet the want in question; there was needed a history properly so called, such as that which Luke announces in his programme. And if Paul, among the helpers who surrounded him, had an evangelist distinguished for his gifts and culture,—and we know from 2 Cor. viii. 18, 19, that there was really one of this description,—how could he help casting his eyes on him, and encouraging him to undertake so excellent a work? Such is the task which Luke has discharged. It is neither by adducing the prophecies, nor by the personal greatness of Jesus, nor by his declarations respecting His heavenly origin, that the author of the third Gospel has sought to establish or strengthen the faith of his readers. It is by the consecutive exposition of that unique history whose final events have become the holy object of faith. The beginning explains the middle, and the middle the end; and from this illuminated close the light is reflected back on the events which have led to it. It is a well-com-

pacted whole, in which the parts mutually support one another. Luke's Gospel is the only one which in this view presents us with the Gospel history. It is very truly, as it has been called, the Gospel of the *development* (M. Félix Bovet).

The heavenly exaltation of Jesus was, if one may so speak, the first stage in the march of Christian work. There was a second more advanced: the state of things which this work had reached at the time when the author wrote. The name of Christ preached throughout all the world, the Church founded in all the cities of the empire; such was the astounding spectacle which this great epoch presented. This result was not, like the life of Jesus, an object of faith to the Gentiles; it was a fact of felt experience. It required to be, not demonstrated, but explained, and in some respects justified. How had the Church been founded, and how had it grown so rapidly? How had it become open to the Gentiles? How were the people of Israel, from the midst of whom it had gone forth, themselves excluded from it? How reconcile with this unexpected event God's faithfulness to His promises? Could the work of Christianity really be under those strange conditions a divine work? All these were questions which might justly be raised in the minds of believers from among the Gentiles, as is proved by the passage ix.–xi. of the Epistle to the Romans, where Paul studies this very problem with a view to the wants of ancient Gentiles (xi. 13). Only, while Paul treats it from the standpoint of Christian speculation, and answers it by a *Theodicée*, the book of Acts labours to solve it historically. The first part of this book exhibits the Church *being born* by the power of the Spirit of the glorified Christ, but coming into collision at its first step with official Judaism. The second part exhibits God *preparing* for the new progress which this work was to make through the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and Israel at the same time shedding the blood of Stephen, and the king of Israel slaying or disposed to slay the two chief apostles,—in a word, the rebellion of Israel in the Holy Land. The last part, finally, represents the divine work *embracing* the Gentile world, and the ministry of Paul crowned with a success and with wonders equal at least to those which had signalized the ministry of Peter,—most certainly this parallelism, as

Schneckenburger has observed, is before the mind of the author,—while Judaism continues its opposition in every city of the pagan world where Paul preaches, and at length consummates that opposition in the very heart of the empire, in the capital of the world, by the conduct of the rulers of the Roman synagogue. Such is the end of the book. Is not the intention of such a writing clear? The narrative is a justification. But this justification is not, as has been unworthily thought, that of a man, St. Paul. The aim of the Acts is more exalted. By its simple and consecutive statement of events, this book purports to give the explanation and justification of the way in which that great religious revolution was carried through, which transferred the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles; it is the apology of the divine work, that of God Himself. God had left the Gentiles only for a time, *the times of ignorance;* He had temporarily *let them walk in their own ways* (Acts xvii. 30, xiv. 16). At the end of this time, Israel, first saved, was to become the instrument of universal salvation, the apostle of Christ to all nations. But this glorious calling which the apostles so often held out to it was obstinately rejected, and the kingdom of God, instead of being established by it, was forced to pass aside from it. It was therefore not God who broke with His people; it was the people who broke with their God. Such is the fact which the book of Acts demonstrates historically. It is thus, in a way, the counterpart of Genesis. The latter relates how the transition took place from primitive universalism to theocratic particularism, through God's covenant with Abraham. The Acts relate how God returned from this temporary particularism to the conclusive universalism, which was ever His real thought. But while simply describing the fact, the Acts explain and justify the abnormal and unforeseen form in which it came about.

The end common to Luke's two writings is therefore to strengthen faith, by exhibiting the principle and phases of that renewal which his eye had just witnessed. Two great results had been successively effected before the eyes of his contemporaries. In the person of Jesus, the world had received a Saviour and Master; this Saviour and Master had

established His kingdom over humanity. The Gospel sets forth the first of those events; the Acts the second. The Gospel has for its subject the invisible revolution, the substitution in the person of Jesus Himself of the dispensation of the Spirit for the reign of the letter, the transforming of the relations of God to man, salvation, the principle of that historical revolution which was to follow. The Acts narrate the external revolution, the preaching of salvation with its consequences, the acceptance of the Gentiles, and their substitution in the place of Israel. Salvation and the Church, such are the two works of God on which the author meant to shed the light of the divine mind. The Ascension linked them together. The goal of the one, it was the foundation of the other. Hence the narrative of the Ascension becomes the bond of the two writings. The aim of the work, thus understood, explains its beginning (the announcement of the forerunner's birth), its middle (the Ascension), and its end (Paul and the synagogue at Rome).

II.—*The Time of Composition.*

The very various opinions regarding the date of our Gospel (Introd. § 3) may be arranged in three groups. The first class fix it before the destruction of Jerusalem, between 60 and 70; the second, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the first century (Holtzmann, from 70 to 80; Keim, about 90); the third, Baur and his school, in the first part of the second century (Volkmar, about 100; Hilgenfield, Zeller, from 100 to 110; Baur, after 130). The traditions which we have quoted (§ 3) and the facts which we have enumerated (§ 1) seem to us at once to set aside the dates of the third group, and to be unfavourable to the second. Tradition has preserved to us only one precise date, that given by Clement of Alexandria, when he places the composition of Luke before that of Mark, and fixes the latter at the period of Peter's sojourn at Rome, that is to say, in 64 (according to Wieseler), or between 64 and 67 (according to others). Following this view, our Gospel must have been composed between 60 and 67. The opinion of Irenæus is not, as is often said, opposed to this (§ 3). Let us examine the objections raised by criticism to this traditional date,

which would place the composition of our Gospel antecedently to the destruction of Jerusalem.

1. The great number of *gospel narratives* already published before our Gospel, according to the prologue, presupposes a somewhat advanced period of the apostolic age.[1]—But why might not numerous attempts at compiling traditions relative to the history of Jesus have been made during the first thirty years which followed events so great? "Though the art of writing had not yet existed, it would have been invented for such a subject," says Lange. When, especially, the generation of the immediate witnesses of the life of our Saviour began to be cleared away by death, and when the apostles, His official witnesses, left Palestine to go and preach to other nations, was it not inevitable that the gospel literature should appear to fill up this double void? Now it was about the year 60, at the latest, that those circumstances emerged.

2. The work of Luke betrays a certain amount of *criticism*, in regard to its sources, which leads to a date posterior to the destruction of Jerusalem.—But from the time when the author had before him a certain number of works on the subject, it is evident that he could not compose his narrative without estimating those sources critically; that might be done at any period. All that was needed for it was leisure.

3. The influence of *legend* (Overbeck) is alleged in the writings of Luke, and a Paulinism already in a state of decadence (Reuss, so far as Acts is concerned).—But has the third Gospel presented to us a single description resembling that of the fire lighted in the Jordan at the time of the baptism, which Justin relates; or a single word which has any resemblance to the account of the marvellous vines of the millennial kingdom, in Papias; or a single scene amplified like that which is drawn by the Gospel of the Hebrews of the interview between Jesus and the rich young man (see on the passage)? Such are the traces of the influence of myth. Luke is entirely free from it. As to the weakening of the Pauline idea, we shall not be able to treat it thoroughly till chap. iv. We shall only say here, that so far from its being the fact that Luke gives us a Paulinism in a state of decline,

[1] Keim: "*Eine reiche Evangelien-Literatur zeigt den vorgerückten Blüthbestand des Christenthums.*"

it is Paul himself who, in the Acts, following the example of Jesus in the Gospel, agrees to realize Christian spirituality only in the restricted measure in which it is practicable. Fidelity to principle does not prevent men of God from exercising that prudence and charity which in practice can take account of a given situation.

4. The siege of Jerusalem is described in the prophecy of Jesus in so precise and detailed a form (xix. 43, 44, xxi. 20–24), in comparison with the compilations of Matthew and Mark, that it is impossible to assert that Luke's account is not subsequent to the event.—Jesus predicted the destruction of Jerusalem, that is certain. The witnesses who accused Him of this before the Sanhedrim did not invent what was absolutely false, and Stephen rested his statement on some such prophecy (Acts vi. 14). Now if Jesus predicted this catastrophe as a prophet, there is no reason why He should not have prophetically announced some details of it. But if He predicted it simply through the force of His political insight, He could not but be aware also that this destruction implied a siege, and that the siege could not take place without the means in use at the time (investment, trenches, etc.), and would be followed by all the well-known terrible consequences. Now nothing in the details given passes beyond the measure of those general indications.

5. The final advent of our Lord, it is further said, stands in Mark and Matthew in immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, while in Luke it is widely separated from it by the interval of the *times of the Gentiles* (xxi. 24). In other passages, besides, the idea of the proximity of the Parousia is designedly effaced; so ix. 27, where Luke makes Jesus say that some of the disciples present shall see, not "*the Son of man coming* in His kingdom" (Matthew), but simply *the kingdom of God.* This all proves that, at the period when Luke was writing, experience had already led the Church to give up the idea that the return of Christ would immediately follow (εὐθέως in Matthew) the destruction of Jerusalem.—We hold that the relation of immediate succession between the two events laid down by Matthew proves that his Gospel was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem; but we cannot admit, what is held by the entire body almost

of modern critics, that the interval supposed by Luke between those two events proves the date of his Gospel to be after that catastrophe. We have already treated several points bearing on this question in our exegesis (vol. ii. pp. 259–261). The decisive question here is how Jesus Christ Himself spoke on the subject. We think we have given indubitable evidence, from a very large number of His sayings, that in His view His advent was to be separated by a considerable period, not only from the time that He was speaking, but from the destruction of Jerusalem, which, according to Him, was to happen during the lifetime of the contemporary generation. The bridegroom who delays his coming; the porter who has to watch late or till *midnight*, or till *cockcrow*, or even till *morning*, waiting for his master; the parable of the leaven, which exhibits the gospel slowly and by a process wholly from within transforming the relations of human life, that gospel which must be preached before His return throughout the whole world, while the apostles shall not even have had time to announce it to all the cities of Israel before the judgment of the nation, etc. etc.,—all proves to us that Jesus Himself never confounded in one and the same catastrophe the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the present dispensation. Hence it follows, that if Jesus expressed His view on this subject, He must have spoken as Luke makes Him speak, and not as Matthew makes Him speak; that consequently He must really have delivered two distinct discourses on those two subjects so entirely different in His eyes, and not one merely in which He blended the two events in a single description (Matt. xxiv.). Now this is precisely what Luke says (see chap. xvii., on the return of Christ, and chap. xxi., on the destruction of Jerusalem). If it is so, with what right can it be alleged that Luke could not recover the historical truth on this point as he has succeeded in doing on so many others, and that his essentially more accurate account of the sayings of Jesus is produced only by a deliberate alteration of the documents which he had before him? What! Luke returned by the path of error or falsehood to historical truth! Really criticism here exacts more from sound sense than it can bear. Besides, it is psychologically impossible that Luke should have indulged in *manipulating* at pleasure the sayings of that

Being on whom his faith was fixed, whom he regarded as the Son of God. Again, in this respect criticism ascribes a procedure to him which sound sense rejects. The sayings of our Lord may have been involuntarily modified by tradition, and have come to the evangelists in different and more or less altered forms; but we cannot allow that they invented or changed them deliberately. In what results are we landed if we take the opposite view? It is asserted that some unknown poet put into the mouth of Jesus, about 68, the eschatological discourse, Matt. xxiv.; then, ten or twenty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, Luke not less knowingly and deliberately transformed this discourse to meet the exigencies of the case! But we ask: if such were really the origin of our Lord's discourses, would they be *what they are?* Would their general harmony, and the points so often observed at which they fit into one another, be *what they are,* especially in our synoptics?

In opposition to those reasons which appear to us to be of little weight, the following are the proofs which the book itself furnishes, to the fact of its being composed before the destruction of Jerusalem: 1. The aim which, as we have seen, explains the Gospel and the Acts, coincides thoroughly with that of the great epistles of St. Paul, especially of the Epistle to the Romans; besides, the correspondences in detail between the third Gospel and that letter are so many and striking, that it is almost impossible to deny that the two writings proceeded from the same surroundings and at the same period. For they are evidently intended to meet the same practical wants.[1] The main fact here is, that Luke resolves historically precisely the same problem of the rejection of Israel and the

[1] In the first two chapters of Luke, Jesus is described as the son of David by His descent from Mary, and as the Son of God by His supernatural birth; St. Paul begins the Epistle to the Romans with the words: "Made *of the seed of David* according to the flesh, and declared to be the *Son of God* in virtue of the *spirit of holiness.*" Luke's two writings, in their unity, demonstrate Israel's right of priority in regard to the kingdom of God; what else is this than the privilege of the πρῶτον, *first,* expressly attributed to the Jews by St. Paul, Rom. i. 16? Jesus, in Luke, is circumcised on the eighth day, and presented in the temple on the fortieth,—two ceremonies which subject Him during His earthly life to the law; Paul, as if he were alluding to those facts related only by Luke, calls Jesus "*a minister of the circumcision*" (Rom. xv. 8), and speaks of Him, Gal. iv. 4, "*made of a woman, made under the law.*" Luke, in the Acts,

calling of the Gentiles which Paul treats speculatively in the important passage, Rom. ix.–xi.

2. The purity of the tradition, the freshness and simplicity of the narratives, and especially the appropriateness which Luke is able to restore to the sayings of Jesus, and which alone makes their full charm felt, do not admit of the view that this book was written at a considerable distance from the events, and that it was wholly outside the circle of the first witnesses. The destruction of Jerusalem had not yet burst over the Holy Land and scattered that Primitive Christian Society, when such information was collected as that to which we owe records so vivid and pure.

3. The book of Acts, certainly written after the Gospel, does not seem to have been composed after the destruction of Jerusalem. True, it has been alleged that viii. 26 proves the contrary, but without the least foundation, as Overbeck acknowledges. The words: "*Now it is desert,*" in this passage, refer not to the town of Gaza, but to the route pointed out by the angel, either to distinguish it from another more frequented way (Overbeck), or, as appears to us more natural, to explain the scene which is about to follow. How would it be possible for this writing, at least in its last lines, not to contain the least allusion to this catastrophe, nor even a word touching the death of St. Paul, which must have preceded it by a few years? We have already discussed this question (Introd. p. 13 et seq.). We shall sum up by saying that if, on the one hand, the mention of the term of two years, in the last verses of the Acts, clearly assumes that a new phase in Paul's life had begun after his captivity, on the other hand the complete silence of the author as to the end of the apostle's career proves that this phase had not yet terminated. The

declares the universality of the divine revelation which preceded that of the Gospel: "*God left not Himself without witness among the Gentiles;*" Paul, Rom. i. 19, 20, likewise declares the revelation of the invisible God made to the Gentiles the works of creation. Luke points to the Good Samaritan doing instinctively what neither the priest nor the Levite, though holders of the law, did; Paul, Rom. ii. 14–15, 26–27, speaks of the Gentiles who do *by nature the things contained in the law,* and who thereby *shall condemn the Jew,* who hears, but at the same time breaks that law. Luke speaks of the *times of ignorance,* during which God *suffered* the nations *to walk* in their own ways; Paul, of the *forbearance* which God showed in regard to past sins, *during the time of His long-suffering* (Rom. iii. 25). It would be tedious to prolong this parallel.

Acts must therefore have been written in the interval between the end of Paul's first captivity at Rome (in the spring of the year 64) and his martyrdom (about 67).[1] The Gospel must have been composed a short time before.

Again, it has been alleged that a considerable interval must have elapsed between the composition of those two writings; because the tradition followed by Luke in the Acts, in regard to the ascension, differs from that which dictated the account of the event in the Gospel, and consequently supposes new information. We have proved in our exegesis that this hypothesis is erroneous. The account in the Gospel is given summarily, with the view of presenting in the subsequent work a more complete view of the event.

4. We have explained in the introduction, the influence which Luke exercised on the unauthentic conclusion of Mark, by supposing that the first of those works appeared about the time when the composition of the second must have been interrupted (at the passage, Mark xvi. 8). We shall here take a step further. If it is true, as seems to be the consequence of the exegesis, that Luke was not acquainted either with the Gospel of Matthew or Mark, it follows that he wrote shortly after those two Gospels had appeared; otherwise he would not have failed to know works of such importance on the subject which he was treating. If therefore our exegetical result is established, we must conclude that the Gospel of Luke was composed almost simultaneously with the other two synoptics. We shall examine the premises of this conclusion more closely in chap. iii. Now, if it follows from the confounding of the two discourses on the destruction of Jerusalem and on the end of the world, in Matthew and Mark, that those writings are anterior to the first of those events, supposing that Luke did not know either the one or the other of them, he must share in this priority.

It seems to us on all these accounts that the composition of the Gospel and of the Acts must be placed between the years 64 and 67, as was indicated by tradition.

[1] The words of Paul, Acts xx. 25, do not prove that the Acts were written after Paul's death, as has been alleged. For Luke does not make Paul, any more than Jesus, speak according to his own fancy.

III.—*The Author.*

Here we start from a fact universally admitted, namely, the identity of the author of the Gospel and of the Acts. This is one of the few points on which criticism is unanimous. Holtzmann says (p. 374): "It must now be admitted as indisputable, that the author of the third Gospel is one and the same person with the author of the Acts." Indeed, the identity of the style, the correspondence of the plan, and the continuity of the narrative, do not admit of the least doubt in this respect, as Zeller also proves.

Who is this author? Tradition answers: Luke, Paul's fellow-labourer. If it goes so far as to ascribe to Paul himself a share in the composition, this is a later amplification which, as we have seen (Introd. p. 27), is foreign to the primitive statement.

No other objections are raised against the truth of this traditional assertion, than the arguments alleged to prove the composition of our two writings in the second century, a time at which there could no longer be a fellow-labourer of St. Paul. Those arguments having been refuted, it only remains to bring forward from those two writings the positive reasons to be alleged in support of the indication furnished by tradition:—

1. It appears from the prologue that the author was not one of the apostles, but one of their *immediate disciples*, "a Christian of the second apostolic generation" (Renan). This is implied in the words: "As they delivered them unto *us*, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses of these things."

2. This disciple was a Christian from among the Gentiles; for, as Holtzmann observes, it is not probable that a Jewish Christian would have spoken of the elders *of the Jews* (vii. 3), of a city *of the Jews* (xxiii. 51), etc. etc. (The position of John, in whom we find similar expressions, was entirely different. In his case this form of expression is explained by reasons of a peculiar nature.)

3. This Greek Christian was a believer formed in the school of Paul. This is proved by that breath of broad universalism which inspires his two writings, and more particularly by the

correspondence as to the institution of the Holy Supper in his account and Paul's.

4. He must even have been one of the apostle's fellow-labourers in the work of evangelization, at least if he is speaking of himself in the passages where the first person plural occurs in the book of Acts. And this explanation seems to be the only admissible one. If it is well-founded, it further follows that the author cannot be one of the fellow-labourers of Paul who are designated by name in the Acts, for he never speaks of himself except anonymously.

5. This apostolic helper must have been a man *of letters*. This is proved by the prologue prefixed to his work, the classic style of this piece, as well as of those passages of the Acts which he composed independently of any document (the last parts of the book); finally, by the refined and delicate complexion of mind and the historical talent which appear in his two writings.

Now all those features belong signally to Luke. We have seen (Introd. p. 16):

1. Paul ranks Luke among the Christians of Greek origin. 2. He assigns him a distinguished place within the circle of his disciples and fellow-labourers. 3. The title physician which he gives him leads us to ascribe to him a scientific and literary culture probably superior to that of the other apostolic helpers.

Not only do the criteria indicated all apply to Luke, but they do not apply well to any other. Barnabas was of Jewish origin, for he was a Levite; Silas also, for he belonged to the Primitive Church at Jerusalem. Timothy was a young Lycaonian, probably without culture, which explains the timid shrinking which seems to have characterized him as an evangelist (1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11; 2 Tim. i. 6–8). Besides, all these are designated by name in the Acts. Luke only (with the exception of Titus) never appears by name. We see that the evidences borrowed from Luke's writings harmonize with those furnished by the epistles of Paul, and that both coincide with the traditional statement. Now, as it is not likely that the Primitive Church gave itself to the critical investigation which we have been making, this agreement between the critical result and the historical testimony raises the fact of the

authorship of St. Luke to the highest degree of scientific certainty.

Moreover, all the authors whose judgment has not been perverted by the prejudices of the Tübingen criticism are at one respecting the person of the author. "It is impossible," says Holtzmann, "to understand why Luke should not be the author of this Gospel." "The author of this Gospel," says M. Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 16), "is certainly the same as the author of the Acts of the Apostles. Now the author of the Acts is a companion of St. Paul, a title which perfectly applies to Luke." Keim thus expresses himself (p. 81): "There is no room to doubt that this writing was composed by the companion of Paul. At least it is incomprehensible how by pure conjecture a man should have been definitely singled out whose name so rarely appears in the epistles of the apostle."

IV.—*The Place of Composition.*

Some very uncertain traditions place the composition (as we have seen, Introd. § 3) at Alexandria (many MSS. Mnn.), in Greece (Beotia and Achaia, Jerome), or at Rome. A modern critic, Köstlin, has proposed Asia Minor.

We find little ground in the two writings for deciding between those different possibilities. The explanations appended to certain geographical names by no means prove, as some seem to think, that the author did not write in the country to which those localities belonged; they only prove that he did not suppose those localities known to Theophilus or to his readers in general. Thus it cannot be concluded, as has been attempted from the explanation respecting the city of Philippi (Acts xvi. 12), that he did not write in Macedonia; nor from those about Athens (xvii. 21), that he did not write in Attica; nor from those about the Fair Havens and Phenice (xxvii. 8–12), that he did not write in Crete; and as little from explanations about localities in Palestine (Luke i. 26, iv. 31, Nazareth, Capernaum, cities of Galilee; viii. 26, the country of the Gadarenes, opposite Galilee; xxiii. 51, Arimathea, a city of the Jews; xxiv. 13, Emmaus, 60 furlongs from Jerusalem; Acts i. 12, the Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem), that he did not write in Palestine. What those passages prove is, that he did not write for the Christians of

Palestine or Macedonia, or Attica or Crete, at least exclusively. Because of the absence of similar explanations regarding certain Sicilian and Italian localities (Acts xxviii. 12, Syracuse; ver. 13, Rhegium, Puteoli; ver. 15, Appii Forum and the Three Taverns), it does not necessarily follow that he wrote in Sicily, in Italy, or in Rome, but only that he knew those localities to be familiar to his readers. It must be confessed, however, that from the country of his readers we may draw an inference in regard to the place of composition; for it is natural to suppose that an author writes for the public with which he finds himself immediately surrounded.

The evidences which Zeller thinks he has discovered in favour of Rome as the place of composition either depend on his explanation of the aim of Luke's writings, which has been proved false, or are unsupported, for example, when he alleges the interest which the author shows for this city by making the foundation of the Roman church by Paul the culminating point of his narrative. Now the fact is, as we have proved, that this last chapter of the Acts has an altogether different bearing.

The reasons alleged by Köstlin and Overbeck in favour of Ephesus are not more conclusive. 1. It is asserted that Marcion, on his way from Asia Minor to Rome, brought thence Luke's Gospel. But by that time this writing was spread—this is proved by facts (Introd. § 1), as well as the other two synoptics—throughout all the churches. Marcion did not introduce it into western Christendom; he merely chose it among the received Gospels as the one which he could the most easily adapt to his system. 2. The author of the Acts loves to describe the persons who afterwards played a part in Asia Minor.—But John, the chief personage of the church of Asia at the end of the first century, is wholly eclipsed in the Acts by Peter and Paul. 3. The Acts relate with predilection Paul's sojourn at Ephesus.—True, but in such a way as to place in relief Peter's ministry at Jerusalem. Paul's sojourn at Ephesus was the culminating point of his apostolate, as the times which followed Pentecost were the apogee of Peter's.

Evidences so arbitrary cannot lay a foundation for any solid result. Once assured of the author's person, we should

rather start from his history. Luke was at Rome with St. Paul from the spring of the year 62 (Acts xxviii.); he was still there when the epistles were sent to the Colossians and Philemon. But when the apostle wrote to the Philippians about the end of 63 or beginning of 64, he had already left Rome, for Paul sends no greeting from him to this church, so well known to Luke. When, therefore, the two years' captivity of the apostle spoken of in the Acts came to a close, and consequently that captivity itself, he was no longer with the apostle. Some years later, when Paul, imprisoned at Rome for the second time, sent from that city the Second Epistle to Timothy, Luke was again with him. Where did he reside in the interval? Probably in Greece, among those churches of Macedonia and Achaia, in whose service he had laboured along with Paul, and in Achaia rather than Macedonia, seeing Paul does not salute him in the Epistle to the Philippians. Might it not then be at this period and in this latter country, "*in the countries of Achaia and Beotia*," as Jerome says, that he composed his Gospel?[1] As to the Acts, he must have composed it somewhat later, probably at Rome beside Paul, shortly before his martyrdom in 67. The parchments which Paul asked Timothy to bring him from Asia, at the time when *only Luke was with him*, were perhaps documents which were to be used in this work; for example, the summaries of the admirable discourses at Antioch, Athens, and Miletus, which are like jewels set in the narrative of the Acts. The work was published when the head of the apostle fell under the sword. Hence the absence of all allusion to that event. The composition of the Acts, both in respect of place and date, would be nearly connected with that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with which Luke's writings have several other features of agreement which are highly remarkable.[2]

[1] We went further in the development of this hypothesis in our first edition. We supposed Corinth, and even the house of Gaius, Paul's host in that city (Rom. xvi. 23), as the place of composition. M. G. Meyer has rightly observed in his review, that in this case there was no reason to hinder Luke from taking textually from First Corinthians the account of the institution of the Holy Supper. We therefore withdraw those hypothetical details.

[2] As to the situation, the author of this epistle (we should say Luke, if the reasons in favour of Barnabas or Silas did not seem to us to preponderate) is

CHAPTER III.

THE SOURCES OF LUKE, AND THE RELATION OF THE SYNOPTICS TO ONE ANOTHER.

We have reached the most arduous, but not the least important part of our task. This domain is that of hypothesis; but as it is from the most remote and inaccessible mountain regions that the rivers which fertilize and the torrents which devastate come down, so it is from the obscure regions into which we are about to enter that we get those widely various and yet influential criticisms on the value of the Gospel history, which find their way even to the people. We shall first take up what concerns the third Gospel in particular; then we shall extend our study to the other two synoptics. For those three writings are of a piece, and every definitive judgment on the one involves a result gained in regard to the other two.

I.—*The Sources of Luke.*

Two questions present themselves:—

I. Is Luke dependent either on Matthew or Mark?

II. And if not, what were the true sources of this work?

I.

We have throughout the whole of our commentary exhibited, in the narrative and style, those characteristics which seem to us to demonstrate Luke's *entire independence* in respect of Mark and Matthew. It only remains to recapitulate those proofs, while we apply them to refute the contrary hypotheses.

about to set out from Italy with Timothy, just delivered from prison (after the martyrdom of Paul). For internal analogies compare the following passages:—

Luke i. 2, ...	Heb. ii. 8.,
,, ii. 16, ...	,, i. 6, 8, 10.
,, ii. 7, ...	,, ii. 14.
,, ii. 40, 52, ...	,, ii. 17, etc.
In Luke, the transformation of the Mosaic system into spiritual obedience.	In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the transformation of the Levitical *cultus* into a spiritual *cultus*.

In both, the idea of the *human* development of Jesus forming the foundation of the Christology.

A. As to Luke's independence *in relation to Matthew*, we shall not rest our conclusion on the numerous narratives which the first has more than the second. This fact would prove only one thing: that if Matthew served as a source to Luke, he was not the only one, at least unless we hold, with Baur, that Luke invented whatever he contains more than Matthew, —an assertion which seems to us to be already sufficiently refuted. Neither shall we allege the many narratives of Matthew which are wanting in Luke; for we are aware of the reasons which might lead the follower to omit certain facts related by his predecessor. But we appeal to the following facts:—

1. Luke's *plan* is entirely independent of that of Matthew; for it appears to us superfluous, after the investigations which we have just carried through, again to refute the opinion of Keim, according to which Luke's plan is no other than that of Matthew *spoiled*. What appears to us above all inconceivable, is that in the account of the journey (from ix. 51) Luke should not even have mentioned Perea, which Matthew expressly makes the theatre of the corresponding journey (xix. 1). Especially at the point where Luke's narrative rejoins Matthew's (xviii. 15, comp. with Matt. xix. 13), one would expect such an indication without fail.

2. The *series of narrations* in Luke is wholly independent of that in Matthew. Two or three analogous groups like those of the baptism and temptation, of the two Sabbatic scenes (Luke vi. 1 et seq. and parall.), of the aspirants to the kingdom of God (Luke ix. 57 et seq. and parall.), and of the various scenes belonging to the Gadara excursion (Luke viii. 22–56), etc., are easily explained by the moral or chronological connection of the events, in virtue of which they formed one whole in tradition. Besides, there are not wanting features to prove, even in this respect, the independence of the two narratives. For example, the insertion of the accounts of the healing of the paralytic and of the calling of Matthew in Matthew's narrative of the Gadara excursion, and Luke's adding of a third aspirant unknown to Matthew.

3. In the narrative parts common to both, the independence of Luke in the *details of the accounts* is obvious at every word. The author who wrote Luke i. ii. could not have had before

him Matt. i. ii., unless he had the formal intention of contradicting him. So Keim supposes that Luke had a Matthew before him which did *not yet* contain the accounts of the infancy! In the narrative of the temptation, would Luke take the liberty of inverting the order of the temptations, and of omitting the appearance of the angels? Would he suppress the rite of the confession of sins in his description of John's baptism? In his account of the baptism would he modify the terms of the divine utterance? So in that of the transfiguration (see the exegesis). In the narrative of the calling of Matthew himself, would he change that apostle into an unknown person, named Levi? Would he expressly refer to another Sabbath the second Sabbatic scene (vi. 6) which Matthew places on the same day as the first (xii. 9)? Would he mention a single demoniac at Gadara, a single blind man at Jericho, in cases where Matthew mentions two? When borrowing the conversation at Cesarea Philippi from Matthew, would he omit to indicate the locality where it took place? Or would he introduce into the text of his predecessor such puerile changes as the substitution of *eight* days for *six*, in the narrative of the transfiguration, etc. etc.? We shall be told he used another source in those cases in which he had more confidence. This supposition, which we shall examine more closely, would solve some of those enigmas indifferently, but not all. In particular, the omissions of details remain unexplained.

4. In reporting the *sayings* of Jesus, not to speak here of the dislocation of the great discourses, how could Luke alter so seriously the terms of such a document as the Lord's Prayer, or of a declaration so grave as that regarding the blasphemy against the Spirit, etc. etc.; and then, on the other hand, indulge in such petty changes as the transformation of the sheep fallen into the pit into an ox, or of the two sparrows which are sold for a farthing into five which are sold for two farthings? How could he introduce into the middle of the Sermon on the Mount two sayings which seem to break its connection (vi. 39, 40), and which must be taken from two discourses, held in entirely different situations, according to Matt. (xv. 14, x. 25), where, besides, they have an altogether different application? Have we here again the

fact of another document? But, in conclusion, to what purpose does he use Matthew? And would this preference for the other source go so far as to lead him to omit such sayings as these: "*Come unto me . . .*" which Matthew presented to him? For who could take in earnest the attempt to answer this proposed by Holtzmann (see pp. 46, 47)?

5. The chief reason for which it is thought necessary to regard Matthew as one of Luke's sources, is the identical expressions and parts of phrases which occur both in the discourses and in the parallel narratives. But whence comes it that this resemblance is, as M. Nicolas says, *intermittent*, and that not only in the same narrative, but in the same paragraph and in the same phrase? Did Luke slavishly copy Matthew for a quarter of a line, and then in the next quarter write independently of him? But this is child's play, if the sense is the same; it is still worse, if the change alters the sense. We know the answer which is again given here: he had not Matthew only, but other documents as well before him; he combines together those various texts. Behold our author, then, borrowing three words from one document, two from another, four from a third, and that in every phrase from beginning to end of his Gospel! Who can admit the idea of such patchwork? Need we here reproduce the well-known jest of Schleiermacher at Eichhorn's hypothesis (*Schr. d. Luk.* p. 6)? Is it not enough to say, with Lange: "The process of death to explain the work of life"? No; such mechanical inlaying could never have become that flowing, simple, and limpid narrative which we admire in our Gospel. Let the parable of the sower be reperused in a synopsis, comparing the two texts, and it will be felt that to maintain that the first of those texts is derived from the other, in whole and in part, is not only to insult the good faith, but the good sense, of the second writer.

6. Weiss has pointed out that a number of Matthew's favourite expressions (*βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, παρουσία, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, σεληνιάζεσθαι, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*, etc.) are completely foreign to Luke. If he had copied Matthew's text, how could one or other of those terms have failed now and again to escape from his pen?

7. Luke's Gospel abounds in *Aramaising* forms, not only in

the passages peculiar to himself, but also in those to which Matthew has parallels. And, strange to say, those Aramaisms are wholly wanting in the text of the latter. We find, on the contrary, a pure, native, vigorous Greek. To suppose, therefore, that Matthew was Luke's principal source, is to believe that the latter, himself a Greek, and writing for Greeks, had arbitrarily foisted his foreign Aramaic phrases into the style of his predecessor. Who can imagine such an anomaly: the Hebrew writer writing good Greek for Hebrews, and the Greek writer cramming his Greek text with Aramaisms for Greeks![1]

B. Luke's independence *in relation to Mark* appears to us evident from the following facts:—

1. Luke's plan is certainly not borrowed from Mark, who has no other plan than the known contrast between the Galilean ministry and the sojourn at Jerusalem, and whose narrative is composed, besides, of detached scenes. That which Klostermann discovers appears to us to be due rather to the critic than to the evangelist. The unity of Mark's work lies elsewhere; it is found in the person of Jesus Himself, whose greatness forms the common basis of all those varied scenes, and in the impression of admiration which it inspires. Therein there is nothing resembling the progressive development which comes to light in Luke's work.

2. No doubt as to the series of events, especially at the beginning, there is a greater agreement between Mark and

[1] The phenomenon is found on the largest scale. Let the following parallels be compared:—

LUKE.	MATTHEW.
v. 1: ἐγένετο . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν . . . καὶ ἴδε.	iv. 18: περιπατῶν δὲ εἶδε.
v. 12, v. 17, 18: καὶ ἐγέν. . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν . . . καὶ ἦσαν . . .; vi. 1.	viii. 1, ix. 1, 2, xii. 9.
viii. 22: καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καὶ αὐτός . . .	viii. 18: ἰδὼν δὲ ἐκέλευσεν.
ix. 18, 28, 37, 57.	xvi. 13, xvii. 1, 14, viii. 19.
xi. 14, xviii. 35, xix. 29.	xii. 22, xx. 29, xxi. 1.
xxiv. 4, 15, 30, 51.	
xx. 11: καὶ προσέθετο πέμψαι ἕτερον (ver. 12); comp. iii. 20.	xxi. 36: πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους.
xx. 21: λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον.	xxii. 16: εἰς πρόσωπον βλέπειν.

Other Hebraistic forms in Luke: σάββατον διυπερσπρῶτον, vi. 1; μεγαλύνειν μετά, i. 58; the καὶ . . καὶ . . , xxiv. 23-35, etc.

Luke than between Luke and Matthew; but not without transpositions much more difficult to explain, on the supposition that Mark was used by Luke, than is the analogy in some series, without any dependence on Luke's part.

3. There is in Luke a more important omission than that of some particular accounts; there is the omission of the whole cycle, Mark vi. 45–viii. 26 (Matt. xiv. 22–xvi. 12). How is such a suppression conceivable, if Luke, who nevertheless aimed at being complete (πᾶσιν, i. 3), makes use of Mark? It has been supposed that there was a gap in the copy of Mark which he possessed; can this reply suffice?

4. The same difference, besides, meets us in regard to the special details of the narratives, and in regard to the style of our Lord's discourses, as between Luke and Matthew. If Luke copies Mark, why does he put the healing of the blind man at Jericho at the departure of Jesus, while Mark puts it at His entrance? Why does he omit the name of Bartimeus, and the picturesque details of Mark's description? What purpose could it serve to mutilate at will such dramatic accounts as that of the healing of the lunatic son? By what caprice substitute for the words of Mark: "*Save* a staff *only*," these apparently contradictory ones: "Nothing, *not even* a staff"? And when Luke clearly places the expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the temple, on the morrow after Palm-day, why put it on that same day? Does Luke make sport of history, and of the Master's words?

5. Of the very many Hebraisms which we have pointed out in Luke, only a very few are found in Mark. Once more, then, Luke made the medley! He, the author of Greek origin, who could write classic Greek, overloading his style with Hebraisms which he does not find in his model!

6. Finally, we call attention to the mixture of slavish dependence and affected originality which would characterize the text of Luke, if he really reproduced the text of Mark. Is not Gieseler right in saying: "And despite such affectation, this work bears a seal of simplicity and of the absence of pretence, which strikes every reader!" Another source has been spoken of as used besides Mark. So we are brought back to that manufacturing of phrases of which we have already spoken. The supposition has been given forth

that Luke used the previous writing entirely from memory. But how could this memory be at once so tenacious as to reproduce the minutest expressions of the original text; and, on the other hand, so treacherous as sometimes to alter the facts so seriously? Here there would be an *intermitting* of memory more difficult still to explain than the intermittence of the style to support which this hypothesis is resorted to.

We conclude that neither Matthew nor Mark, in their present form at least, figured among the sources of Luke. Such, besides, is the conclusion which we might have drawn from his prologue. The manner in which he contrasts the πολλοί (*many*), compilers of previous writings, with the apostles and eye-witnesses of the events, forbids us to rank the Apostle Matthew among the former; so that if he shared the received opinion which ascribed to Matthew the first Gospel, he cannot have ranked this book among the writings of which he speaks. It would certainly not be easier to maintain that, in a heap with so many ephemeral writings, he referred to such an important work as that of Mark, which from the first times the Church (witness Papias, Clement, Irenæus) signalized and regarded as one of the most precious documents regarding the ministry of Jesus.

II.

Those two writings being set aside, what then are the sources from which Luke has drawn?

Criticism has sought to determine the sources of Luke, either from certain characteristics of his style, or from the religious tendencies of certain parts, or from the localities which form the scene of his narrative.

1. Proceeding from the first point of view, Schleiermacher, as is well known, broke up our Gospel into a certain number of detached narratives, which the hand of the compiler had combined in such a way as to form them into a consecutive history. The phrases of transition which we have indicated throughout our Gospel are in his eyes the conclusions of those short writings; they do not belong, according to him, to the general compiler. This hypothesis cannot be maintained: *a.* Because those forms have too much resemblance not to be from the same hand. Besides, they reappear in the narrative

of the Acts. *b.* The unity of style and plan proves that the evangelist was not a mere collector. The author, no doubt, possessed written materials; but he used them in such a way as to work them into a homogeneous whole. As to the two accounts of journeys which Schleiermacher thinks have been amalgamated in one in the piece ix. 51–xix. 27, see at p. 9.

2. We have already spoken of the great Judeo-Christian Gospel, in which Keim finds the substance of the greater part of Luke's Gospel. But as there is no necessity for regarding Luke's narrative as swayed by opposing religious currents, Keim's hypothesis falls to the ground with the fact on which it was based. According to Hilgenfeld, the author consulted a third document besides Matthew and Mark, that which is reproduced in a modified form in the journal (ix. 51–xix. 27). But if this piece formed one whole by itself, whence comes it that, at the point where Luke's account rejoins that of Matthew and Mark (xviii. 15), we find not the least sign of the end of the interpolated piece? Hilgenfeld ascribes an altogether peculiar character to this piece—the austerity of the Christian life; and a special aim—to narrate the formation of a circle of disciples whose work, passing beyond the Jewish domain, was to form a prelude to that of Paul. But this aim enters into the progressive movement of the whole book, and the first characteristic referred to belongs to the entire teaching of Jesus (the rich young man).

3. Köstlin thinks he can maintain a source specially *Judæan* for the events which are said to have passed in Judea, and for those of which Samaria was the theatre, or in which the Samaritan people play a part—a *Samaritan* source. Keim regards this latter, the basis of the account of the journey (ix. 51–xviii. 27), as one and the same work with the document which furnishes the account given in the Acts of the conversion of a Samaritan population (Acts viii.). As well might we speak of an Abyssinian source for the narrative of the noble belonging to the court of Candace, etc. As if it were necessary to bring in local interest into the composition of such a history! For a similar reason, Bleek takes Galilee as the place of the composition of his original Gospel,—the principal source of Matthew and Luke. The preponderance of the Galilean ministry, and the omission of

the journeys to Jerusalem, in this fundamental writing, arise from a predilection of a local nature. This hypothesis is as unsatisfactory. The more elevated the sphere of a narrative is, the less probable is it that the place of its origin determined its horizon. This is not the time to occupy ourselves with other alleged sources of Luke, to the supposition of which criticism has been led by the mysterious relation which unites our three synoptics, expressly the primitive Matthew (or *Logia*) and the proto-Mark. This question will occur when we come to study the relations between the synoptics.

For ourselves, the following is all that we conclude from our exegetical study: 1*st.* We have established a source of purely *Jewish* origin: the genealogical document iii. 23 et seq. (see the exegesis). 2*d.* From i. 5 we have found ourselves face to face with an account of a wholly *Judeo-Christian* character, both in substance, seeing it renders with incomparable freshness the impressions of the first actors in the Gospel drama; and in form, for the style leaves no doubt as to the language in which it was written. This piece (chap. i. and ii.), the Aramaic character of which Luke has preserved in Greek as faithfully as possible, may have been a detached account preserved in the family of Jesus, or have belonged to a more considerable whole, one of the works spoken of by Luke. The other parts of the Gospel, all of which, except the account of the Passion, betray an Aramaic basis, must have emanated also from the Judeo-Christian Church. We shall probably never know whether those pieces were taken from different writings or borrowed from one and the same work. 3*d.* The parts in which this Hebrew character is less perceptible, in matter and form, have probably been composed in Greek on the basis of oral narratives, public or private. Thus the account of the Passion, in which we shall find certain classical turns of expression (xxiii. 12, *προϋπῆρχον*; v. 15, *ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ*; v. 18, *παμπληθεί*), if it is not the work of Luke himself, might be taken from one of the Gospels antecedent to Luke, composed in Greek. 4*th.* The narrative of the institution of the Holy Supper is certainly of *Pauline* origin; comp. 1 Cor. xi. Was this source written? Was it, perhaps, the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians? In this latter case, Luke must have quoted from memory, as seen from the

differences between the two forms. Or was it purely oral? Luke, having often celebrated the Holy Supper with Paul (Acts xx.), might have retained in his memory more or less literally the formula which the apostle used on those occasions. Such is all that we think can be advanced with any probability, proceeding upon the study of the Gospel.

II.—*The Relations and Origin of the Synoptics.*

We shall first examine the systems which are at present current; thereafter, we shall state our own view.

I.

A. Most critics are now agreed on this point, that *Matthew and Mark were not dependent on Luke.* No doubt, Bleek traces back Mark to Matthew *and Luke;* and, according to Volkmar, Matthew was borrowed *from Luke* and Mark. But those opinions do not enjoy anything like general acceptance. Bleek's most plausible argument is that which he derives from certain phrases of Mark, in which the text of the other two seems to be combined. But if Mark was such a close copyist as to place side by side two phrases identical in meaning, that he might not lose a word or part of a phrase belonging to the text of his predecessors, how, on the other hand, would he reject immense pieces from their works, or modify it in so serious a way as he often does? The phenomenon which has misled Bleek, and some others before him, arises simply from that somewhat wordy style of amplification which characterizes Mark, and which appears throughout his whole narrative. As to Volkmar's opinion, it contradicts two obvious facts: the vigorous originality of Matthew's style, and the brevity of his narratives in comparison with Luke's. As an example, let the history of the centurion at Capernaum be taken, in which, for all the steps adopted by him to avoid approaching Jesus personally, and even to prevent His coming under his roof (in Luke), Matthew substitutes the words, "*He came unto Him,* beseeching Him;" or the history of the paralytic, in which Matthew would be made to borrow from Luke the words, "*And seeing their faith,*" after having suppressed all the circumstances to which this expression refers! All this proves nothing, I know, to a man like Volkmar, who thinks that the evangelists manipu-

late their materials according to their caprice. How could the first evangelist have arbitrarily created his great discourses by means of the teachings of Jesus scattered throughout Luke? Such procedure is as inadmissible as the *dislocation* which others ascribe to Luke.

B. Luke being disposed of, the only possible question regarding the origin of Mark and Matthew is this, *Does the one depend on the other?* The general plan in both is very similar (the contrast between the Galilean ministry and the sojourn at Jerusalem). Between those two parts there is also found in both writings a very brief account of the journey through Perea. The order of the narratives is almost identical from the conversation at Cesarea Philippi; there are more considerable differences in the first part of the Galilean ministry, but the cause of them may be ascribed to the manner in which the Sermon on the Mount, omitted by Mark, is prefixed to it in Matthew. Finally, at every moment we meet with identical or similar phrases in both Gospels.

But, on the other hand, if *Mark used Matthew,* whence comes it that, beside those identical phrases, we have continual differences which, on the supposition of a text being before him, assume by their very insignificance an intolerable character of toying and affectation of originality? Whence come those differences in respect of matter,—partly mutilations, partly amplifications, sometimes insoluble or apparent contradictions? As when Mark makes Jesus say, "Nothing, *save* sandals;" where Matthew says, "Take nothing, *not even* sandals." So when, in the narrative of the expulsion of the sellers from the temple, and in that of the barren fig-tree, Mark places those events on a different day from that on which they transpired according to Matthew. So in the account of the calling of Matthew, where Mark, on this supposition, substitutes for the person of the apostle an unknown personage named Levi, without making the slightest allusion to the name of Matthew, which the first Gospel gives to this publican; then, in the cures of the demoniac, and of the blind man of Jericho, in which Mark mentions only one sufferer instead of the two spoken of by his model? Klostermann's opinion, which makes Matthew's account the text on which Mark engrafted the descriptive glosses which he

received from Peter, likewise falls to the ground before the difficulties mentioned.

Or was it *Matthew who used Mark?* But Matthew's method is wholly original and independent of Mark's. He loves to group homogeneous events round a prophetic text. This organic principle is in keeping with the fundamental view of his Gospel.[1] It has nothing in common with the order followed by Mark. Then, in most cases, we should be forced to think that he made it his business to spoil the narratives of his model; so in the cure of the paralytic, in that of the blind man of Jericho, and particularly in that of the lunatic son. Why, besides, omit the names of the four disciples in the conversation of Jesus with the apostles on the Mount of Olives (Mark xiii.)? Why, in relating the preparation for the Passover, say, He sent *His disciples*, as if it was all of them, while his predecessor expressly said, *two* of His disciples? Why omit in the prayer of Gethsemane those beautiful words preserved by Mark, "*Father, all things are possible unto Thee,*" etc. etc.

In fine, it is impossible to conceive anything more capricious and less reverential than the part which we make the author of any one whatever of our synoptic Gospels play, with the history and sayings of Jesus, supposing that he had before him the other two, or one of them. Such an explanation will only be allowable when we are brought absolutely to despair of finding any other. And even then it were better still to say, *Non liquet.* For this explanation involves a moral contradiction. Most of our present critics are so well aware of this, that they have recourse to middle terms. By common sources they seek to explain the relation between those three writings, or they combine this mode with the preceding. We have already described in our introduction the numerous systems of this kind which are proposed at the present day.

[1] After a general prophecy, given as the basis of the entire narrative of the Galilean ministry (iv. 14–16), there follow: 1. The Sermon on the Mount; 2. A collection of deeds of power (chap. viii. and ix.), grouped round the prophecy of Isaiah, quoted viii. 17; 3. The instructions to the Twelve, chap. x.; 4. A collection of the utterances of wisdom (chap. xi. and xii.), grouped round the prophecy of Isaiah, quoted xii. 17; 5. The parables of the kingdom, chap. xiii.; 6. A series of excursions to the east, north, and north-east, filling up the prophetic programme laid down as the basis of the Galilean ministry.

C. Bleek derives Matthew and Luke *from a Greek Gospel, composed in Galilee.* This hypothesis appears to us as unfruitful as those which derive them from one another. Take, for example, the Lord's Prayer. A common text, whence the two evangelists derived the terms of this formulary which both have transmitted to us, is not less inconceivable than the deriving of one of those reports from the other, unless we ascribe to either of them an incredible degree of arbitrariness in regard to a most solemn utterance of the Master. And the same phenomenon reappears from beginning to end of our two Gospels! Besides, the prologue of Luke protests against Bleek's explanation. Luke speaks of *many* Gospel narratives which were in existence at the time when he wrote. Bleek's hypothesis supposes only one. To escape from his difficulty, this critic reduces the many writings of which Luke speaks to simple revisions of that original Gospel; but Luke evidently understood by those many writings not rehandlings of one and the same fundamental work, but different and independent compilations of apostolic tradition.

The hypothesis most in favour in these last times is one which, recognising the originality of Mark, places him at the head of the Gospel historiography, so far at least as the narrative part is concerned, but in an older form: the so-called *proto-Mark, the common source of our three synoptics.* Moreover, a second source was used by Matthew and Luke: the *collection of discourses,* the *Logia* of Matthew. Holtzmann has developed this hypothesis in a work which is one of the finest fruits of critical research in our century. Let us examine those two hypotheses of the *Logia* and the *proto-Mark.*

That there existed a collection of discourses written by the Apostle Matthew which was one of the oldest Gospel documents, we have not the least doubt. The ground of our conviction is not so much the testimony of Papias, of which Gieseler rightly says: "Separated as this notice appears from its context, it is difficult to draw from it any certain conclusion;" it is rather the form of our first Gospel itself in which we meet with great bodies of discourses distributed at certain points of the narrative, and which appear to have existed *as such* antecedently to the work in which they are inserted. It is difficult to avoid the impression that those bodies of dis-

courses originally formed one whole. Weizsäcker has, with a master hand, as it appears to us, traced the plan of this original Matthew (pp. 184–186). The apostolic treatise opened with the Sermon on the Mount; it was the invitation to enter into the kingdom, the foundation of the edifice. There followed as the second part of the collection, the discourses addressed to particular persons, such as the instructions given to the apostles (Matt. x.), the testimony regarding John the Baptist (Matt. xi.), and the great apologetic discourse (Matt. xii.). Finally, the eschatological prophecy (Matt. xxiv., xxv.) constituted the third part; it formed the climax of the collection, the delineation of the hopes of the Church. The other groups of instructions, the collection of parables (chap. xiii.), the discourse on the duties of the disciples to one another and on discipline (chap. xviii.), formed, according to Weizsäcker, an appendix corresponding to certain practical wants of the Church. We would introduce some modifications into this reconstruction of the *Logia* as proposed by Weizsäcker.[1] But this matters little to the question before us: the main thing is, that such a work existed, and very nearly as conceived by Weizsäcker. Holtzmann thinks, on the contrary, that the sayings of Jesus rather appeared in the *Logia* in the form in which we find them in Luke's narrative of the journey (ix.–xviii.); it was the author of our first Gospel, according to him, who grouped them into systematic discourses.

We shall begin by criticising this second view. 1. It seems to us impossible, as we have already remarked in opposition to Volkmar, that the author of a historical work, such as our canonical Matthew, took the liberty of gathering into certain large masses sayings uttered in different circum-

[1] Instead of making the collection of the parables an appendix, we should make it the centre of the work. The *Logia* of Matthew, that collection intended to reproduce our Lord's teaching in its essential characteristics, opened, we should say, with the exposition of the *righteousness* of the kingdom of heaven, in the Sermon on the Mount. There followed the description of the *development* of that kingdom, in the collection of the parables (Matt. xiii.); finally, the great eschatological discourse, Matt. xxiv. and xxv., announcing the *consummation* of the kingdom, was the cope-stone of the edifice. Between those principal parts there were placed, like passages between the apartments properly so called, certain subordinate instructions, such as the discourse on John the Baptist, on the casting out of devils, and on discipline in the Church (Matt. xi., xii., and xviii.).

stances, to form so-called discourses of which he might say they were uttered by Jesus at this or that time. 2. Holtzmann's hypothesis is opposed by the unanimous conviction of the Church, which from the beginning has attached the name of Matthew to our first Gospel. According to this view, it would really be the Gospel of Luke which had preserved the *Logia* in their true form, and which ought to have inherited the name of the Apostle Matthew. By attaching to our first Gospel the name of Matthew, the Church has shown, on the contrary, that it was this work which was the depositary of the treasure bequeathed to the world by this apostle. 3. The strongest objection to the use of the *Logia* by our two evangelists is always, in our view, the wholly different terms in which the teachings of Jesus are conveyed in the two recensions. One *copies* discourses if he believes in them; one *invents* them if he does not. The supposed middle way, three words of copy, three words of invention, seems to us an impossibility. No doubt it might be asserted that each author combined with the use of the common source (the *Logia*) that of different particular sources. But what an impossible procedure is that which we thereby reach! Three words borrowed from the common source, three from one or other of the special sources, and this for the composition of *every* phrase! What a Mosaic! What an amalgam!

Can we, on the other hand, adopt the opinion of Weizsäcker? Were the great discourses of the *Logia*, as preserved intact by Matthew, the source at the same time of the teachings of Jesus, as reported by Luke? No. For: 1. We cannot admit that Luke at his own hand displaced those great discourses. 2. This supposition is rendered untenable by all the proofs which our exegesis has supplied of the truth of the historical prefaces which introduce the declarations reported by Luke. It would be impossible to conceive a procedure more recklessly arbitrary than that which Weizsäcker ascribes to this author, when he makes him invent situations for discourses, discourses which he began by carving out of the *Logia* at pleasure. 3. This arbitrariness would reach its height in the invention of the narrative of the journey, ix. 51–xviii. 27. This journey, according to this view, was out and out a fiction of the writer, intended to serve as a framework

for all the materials which remained unused. What would be thought of a writer who should act in this way after having declared that he would seek to relate all things exactly and in order?

The work of the *Logia* then existed, and we think that it may be found entire in our first Gospel. But it is not thence that Luke has drawn our Lord's discourses. And this result is confirmed by Luke's own declaration, from which it appears that, among the Gospel works which had preceded his own, he found none proceeding from an apostle.

In regard to the second source, that from which the materials of the *narrative* common to our three synoptics is said to have been derived, the proto-Mark, not only do we deny that our three synoptics can be explained by such a work, but we do not believe that it ever existed. 1. Eusebius, who knew the work of Papias, some lines of which have given rise to the hypothesis of an original Mark, distinct from ours, never suspected such a difference; so far as he was concerned, he had no hesitation in applying the testimony of Papias to our canonical Mark. 2. If there had existed a Gospel treatise enjoying such authority that our first three evangelists took from it the framework and the essential materials of their narrative, Luke certainly could not, as he does in his prologue, put the writings anterior to his own in one and the same category, and place them all a degree lower than the narrative which he proposed to write. He must have mentioned in a special manner a document of such importance. 3. Neither the special plan of each of our synoptics, nor the transpositions of histories, nor the differences more or less considerable which appeared in the details of each narrative, can be satisfactorily explained on the supposition of this unique and common source. Compare only the three accounts of the baptism of Jesus, or of the blind man of Jericho (see the exegesis)! And as to the discourses, those at least which are derived from the proto-Mark, take a synopsis and attempt to explain the three texts by a common document, and the levity or puerility which must be ascribed now to the one and again to the other of our three evangelists, to make them draw from one and the same document, will be fully apparent! See, for example, the saying on the blasphemy of the Spirit

(Luke xii. 10 and parall.). In most cases Holtzmann enumerates the differences, and he imagines that he has explained them! 4. The decisive argument seems to us to be that which is founded on the style of the three Gospels. As Weiss says: "A writing so harmoniously and vigorously composed as our first Gospel cannot be an extract from another writing." In no case could it proceed from a writing the literary stamp of which had the least resemblance to that of Mark. And Luke? Once more, it would be he who had taken a fancy to introduce into the text of the proto-Mark those so pronounced Aramaisms which distinguish his Gospel from the other two! From this proto-Mark, from which Matthew derived good Greek for Hebrews, Luke took Hebraised Greek for Greeks! The proto-Mark is a hypothesis which cannot be substantiated either in point of fact or in point of right; for were there really such a writing, it would nevertheless be incapable of doing the service for criticism which it expects from it, that is, supply the solution of the enigma of the synoptics. Besides, the last authors who have written on the subject, Weiss, Klostermann, Volkmar, though starting from the most opposite standpoints, agree in treating this writing, which Schleiermacher introduced into criticism, as a chimera.

But what does Weiss do? Remaining attached to the idea of a written source as the basis of our canonical Gospels, he ascribes to the original Matthew the *Logia*, the part which he refuses to the proto-Mark. Only, he is thereby obliged to assign *historical*, and not merely didactic, contents to this writing. No doubt he does not regard it as a complete Gospel; he thinks that it contained neither the records of the infancy, nor those of the Passion and resurrection. The book of the *Logia* began, according to him, with the baptism; its contents were made up of detached narratives and discourses; it closed with the account of the feast of [illegible]hany. Thereafter came Mark, who laboured under the [illegible]nce of this apostolic Matthew, and first gave the Gospel narrative its complete framework; and those two writings, the *Logia* and Mark, became the common sources of our canonical Matthew and Luke. But, 1. If Weiss justly complains that he cannot form a clear idea of the book of the *Logia* as it is represented by Holtzmann (a writing beginning with the

testimony of Jesus regarding John the Baptist, and closing with a collection of parables), why not apply the same judgment to the apostolic Matthew of Weiss? What is a book beginning with the baptism and ending with the feast of Bethany, if it is not, to the letter, a writing without either head or tail? 2. Would it not be strange if Mark, the work which tradition declares by the mouth of Papias to be destitute of historical order, were precisely that which had furnished the type of the historical order followed by our synoptics? 3. It follows from the prologue, i. 1–4, that when Luke wrote, he had not yet before him any work written by an apostle; and, according to Weiss, he must have had the apostolic Matthew in his hands. 4. While rendering all justice to the perspicacity and accuracy displayed by Weiss in the discussion of texts, one is nevertheless painfully affected with the arbitrariness belonging to such a criticism. It always comes in the end to this, to educe the dissimilar from the same. For this end it must be held, unless one is willing to throw himself into the system of wilful and deliberate alterations (Baur), that the acts and sayings of Jesus were an elastic material in the hands of the evangelists, a sort of India rubber which each of them stretched, lengthened, contracted, and shaped at pleasure. Will a supposition which is morally impossible ever lead to a satisfactory result? The last step to be taken on this view was to assign to the *Logia* of Matthew the totality of the Gospel narrative; this is what Klostermann has done; and so we are brought back to the hypothesis which makes our Matthew, or a writing perfectly similar, the principal source of the other two synoptics.

Holtzmann consoles himself for the little agreement obtained by all this labour up till now, by saying that this immense labour, reaching nearly over a century, cannot remain without fruit. But on a mistaken route it is possible to perform prodigies of agility, to take marvellous leaps, to make forced marches, without advancing a step towards the goal, because the direction is perverse. Such appears to us to be the condition in which criticism has laboured so energetically. Far, then, from seeking still to advance like Weiss[1] in this direction, the time seems to us to have come for

[1] *Das Marcus-Evangelium und seine syn. Parallelen*, 1872.

retracing our steps, in order to recover the way which Luke himself indicated, and which Gieseler brought to light. True, the attempt made by this eminent historian has not been followed; but rather than turn away from it with disdain, criticism should have sought to supply what in it was defective. This is what we shall attempt to do.

II.

If, in the systems which we have passed in review, the difficulty is to reconcile the *differences* between our Gospels with the use of common written sources, or with the dependence which they must be supposed to have on one another, the difficulty for us will be to explain, without such dependence and without such a use, the *resemblances* which in so many respects make those three writings, as it were, one and the same work: resemblance in the plan (omission of the journeys to Jerusalem); resemblance in the sequence of the narratives (identical cycles); resemblance in the matter of the narratives; resemblance sometimes even in details of style. To solve the problem, let us begin by ascending to the source of this river, with its three branches.

After the foundation of the Church, on the day of Pentecost, it was necessary to labour to nourish those thousands of souls who had entered into the new life. Among the means enumerated in the Acts which served to edify the new-born Church, *the apostles' doctrine* (ii. 42) stands in the first place. What does this term mean? It could not suffice to repeat daily to the same persons that proclamation of the death and resurrection of our Lord whereby Peter had founded the Church. It must soon have been necessary to go back on the narrative of Jesus' ministry. But the expression, apostles' *doctrine*, shows that those oral narratives did not bear simply on the acts and miracles of Jesus, but also, and even specially, on His *teachings*. Before Paul and John had set forth our Lord Himself as the essence of the gospel, the apostles' doctrine could not well be anything else than the reproduction and application of the Master's discourses. One day, therefore, it was the Sermon on the Mount; another, the discourse on the relations between believers (Matt. xviii.); a third, the eschatological discourse, by means of which the community of

the faithful was edified. It was repeated, and then commented on. With the exception of John, the Twelve probably never passed beyond this elementary sphere of Christian teaching. It was still within this that Peter moved in his instructions (διδασκαλίαι) as he travelled, and at Rome, at the time of which Papias speaks, and when Mark, his interpreter, accompanied him collecting his narratives. And was it not, indeed, with a view to this special task of "testifying what they had seen and heard," that Jesus had chosen and formed the Twelve? Nor were they slow to abandon the other duties with which they were at first charged, such as the *serving of the* common *tables,* in order to devote themselves exclusively to this work (Acts vi.).

The rich materials for those recitals (John xxi. 24, 25) must at an early period have become contracted and concentrated, both as regards the discourses and the facts. In respect to the latter, for each category of miracles the attention was given preferentially to one or two peculiarly prominent examples. In respect to the discourses, as these were reproduced not in a historical interest, but with a view to the edification of believers, the apostolic exposition gradually fastened on some specially important points in the ministry of Jesus, such as those of the Sermon on the Mount, of the sending of the Twelve, of the announcement of the destruction of the temple, and to the subjects which Jesus had treated of on those occasions, and with which they connected without scruple the most salient of the other teachings of Jesus of a kindred sort. It was a matter of salvation, not of chronology.

They likewise became accustomed, in those daily instructions, to connect certain narratives with one another which had some intrinsic analogy as a bond of union (Sabbatic scenes, aspirants to the divine kingdom, groups of parables), or a real historical succession (the storm, the Gadarene demoniac, Jairus, etc.). Thus there were formed *cycles* of narratives more or less fixed which they were in the habit of relating at one stretch; some cycles united together became *groups,* traces of which we find in our synoptics, and which Lachmann, in his interesting essay on the subject (*Stud. u. Critik.* 1835), has called *corpuscula evangelicæ historicæ;* for example, the group of the Messianic advent (the ministry of John the Baptist,

the baptism and temptation of Jesus); that of the first days of the ministry of Jesus (His teachings and miracles at Capernaum and the neighbourhood); that of the first evangelistic journeys, then of the more remote excursions; that of the last days of His ministry in Galilee; that of the journey through Perea; that of the sojourn at Jerusalem. The order of particular narratives within the cycle, or of cycles within the group, might easily be transposed; a narrative could not so easily pass from one cycle to another, or a cycle from one group into another.

In this process of natural and spontaneous elaboration, all in the interest of practical wants, the treatment of the Gospel must have imperceptibly taken, even down to details of expression, a very fixed form. In the narrative parts, the holiness of the subject excluded all ornamentation and refinement. The form of the narrative was simple, like that of a garment which exactly fits the body. In such circumstances, the narrative of facts passed uninjured through various mouths; it preserved the general stamp which it had received when it was first put into form by the competent witness. A little more liberty was allowed in regard to the historical framework; but, in repeating the words of Jesus, which formed the prominent feature in every narrative, the received form was absolutely adhered to. The jewel remained unchangeable; the frame varied more. The reproduction of the *discourses* was more exposed to involuntary alterations. But precisely here the memory of the apostles had powerful helps; above all, the striking original plastic character of the sayings of Jesus. There are discourses which one might hear ten times without remembering a single phrase verbally. There are others which leave a certain number of sentences indelibly impressed on the mind, and which ten hearers would repeat, many days after, almost identically. Everything depends on the way in which the thoughts are conceived and expressed. Formed within the depths of His soul, the words of Jesus received under the government of a powerful concentration that settled, finished, perfect impress by means of which they became stereotyped, as it were, on the minds of His hearers. This sort of eloquence, besides, took possession of the *whole* man; of conscience, by its moral truth,

of the understanding, by the precision of the idea; of the heart, by the liveliness of feeling; of the imagination, by the richness of its colouring;—and what the whole man has received, he retains easily and faithfully. Finally, the apostles were convinced of the transcendent value of the things which they heard from His mouth; Jesus Himself did not allow them to forget it. They knew that they were called soon to proclaim *from the house-tops* what was *said* to them *in the ear*. They had not heard the warning in vain: "*Take heed how ye hear.*" They conversed daily regarding all that they heard together; and, even during the lifetime of their Master, a common tradition was forming among them. Those sentences standing out in such pure and marked relief graven upon them by frequent repetition, needed only an external call to be drawn forth from their mind in their native beauty, and to be produced almost as they had received them. Indeed, I cannot conceal my astonishment that so great a difficulty should have been found in the fact that the sayings of Jesus are almost identically reproduced in our Gospels. The differences surprise me much more than the resemblances. The source of this fixedness is neither Luke copying Matthew, nor Matthew copying Luke. It is the powerful spirit of a Master like Jesus taking possession of the minds of simple, calm, and teachable disciples like the apostles. This was precisely the result aimed at by that order of providence whereby His Father had brought to Him as disciples, not the scribes and the learned of the capital, but *little children, new bottles, tabulæ rasæ.*

In the first times, evangelization was carried forward in Aramaic, the language of the people and of the apostles. And the poverty of this language, both in syntactical forms and in its vocabulary, also contributed to the fixity of the form which tradition took. But there was, even at Jerusalem, a numerous Jewish population which spoke only Greek—the *Hellenistic* Jews. They possessed in the capital some hundreds of synagogues, where the Old Testament was known only in the translation of the LXX. From the time when the Church welcomed Jews of this class,—and that was from its cradle, as is proved by the narrative Acts vi.,—the need of reproducing in Greek the apostolic system of evangelization must have made itself imperiously felt. This work of translation

was difficult and delicate, especially as regarded the sayings of Jesus. It was not done at random; those of the apostles who knew Greek, such as Andrew, Philip (John xii.), and no doubt Matthew, did not fail to engage in it. There were especially certain expressions difficult to render, for which the corresponding Greek term required to be carefully selected. Once found and adopted, the Greek expression became fixed and permanent; so the words ἐπιούσιος (*daily*) in the Lord's Prayer, and πτερύγιον (*pinnacle*) in the narrative of the temptation,—expressions which have been wrongly quoted to prove the mutual dependence of our Gospels on a common written source.[1] From this Greek mould into which the primitive tradition was cast, it could not but come forth with a more fixed character still than it already possessed in Aramaic.

It maintained itself, no doubt, for some time in this purely oral form, Aramaic and Greek. We may apply to the apostles and evangelists, the depositaries of this treasure, what Dionysius of Halicarnassus says of the Homeric logographers: "They distributed their narratives over nations and cities, not always reproducing them in the same order, but always having in view the one common aim, to make known all those memorials, so far as they had been preserved, without addition and without loss."[2] Basil the Great reports a similar fact: down to his time (fourth century) the Church possessed no written liturgy for the Holy Supper,—the sacramental prayers and formulæ were transmitted *by unwritten instruction*.[3] And was not the immense store of Talmudic traditions, which forms a whole library, conveyed for ages solely by oral tradition?

How was the transition made from oral evangelization to written compilation? The most natural conjecture, adopted by men like Schleiermacher, Neander, and even Bleek, is that they began by writing, not a Gospel,—that would have appeared too great an undertaking,—but detached descriptions, and discourses. It was a hearer who desired to preserve accurately what he had heard, an evangelist who sought to

[1] Holtzmann also adduces, in opposition to me, the verb with its double augment ἀπεκατεστάθη, used in the three synoptics. But the various reading ἀποκατεστάθη is found in the three texts, and usage might have consecrated this form with the double augment, as in some other verbs.

[2] *Judic. de Thucyd.* ii. p. 138, edit. Sylburg (quoted by Gieseler).

[3] *De Spir. Sanct.* c. 27.

reproduce his message more faithfully. At a time when books of prophecy were composed under the names of all the ancient Israelitish personages (Enoch, Esdras, etc.), when collections of apocryphal letters were palmed off on the ancient Greek philosophers,—a Heraclitus, for example,[1]—who would be astonished to find that, among the fellow-labourers and hearers of the apostles, there were some who set themselves to put in writing certain acts and certain discourses of the man whose life and death were moving the world? Those first compositions might have been written in Aramaic and in Greek, at Jerusalem, Antioch, or any other of the lettered cities where the Gospel flourished.

Those *adversaria*, or detached accounts taken from the history of Jesus, were soon gathered into collections more or less complete. Such were probably the writings of the πολλοί mentioned in Luke's prologue. They were not organic works, all the parts of which were regulated by one idea, like our Gospels, and so they are lost,—they were accidental compilations, simple collections of anecdotes or discourses; but those works had their importance as a second stage in the development of Gospel historiography, and a transition to the higher stage. Thus were collected the materials which were afterwards elaborated by the authors of our synoptic Gospels.

In oral tradition thus formed, and then in those first compilations and collections of anecdotes, do we not possess a basis firm enough on the one hand, and elastic enough on the other, to explain the resemblance as well as the diversity which prevails between our three synoptics; and, in fine, to resolve that complicated problem which defies every attempt at solution by so unyielding an expedient as that of a written model?

1. The most striking feature of resemblance in the general plan, the omission of the journeys to Jerusalem, is explained, not perhaps fully, but at least more easily, in the way which we propose than in any other. Oral tradition becoming condensed in the form of detached narratives, and afterwards grouped in cycles, the journeys to Jerusalem, which did not lend themselves so easily to the end of popular evangelization as the varied scenes and very simple discourses of the Galilean

[1] Bernays, *Die Heraclitischen Briefe* (three of which, according to this critic, belong to the first century of our era).

ministry, were neglected. The matter took shape without them; and so much the more, because they did not enter into any of the groups which were formed. When the tradition was compiled, this element in it was wanting, and the gap was not filled up till later, when the narrative of an eye-witness (John) gave a new delineation of the ministry of Jesus in a manner completely independent of the traditional elaboration.

2. If our narratives have such a traditional origin as we have indicated, we can easily explain both the identical series of accounts which we sometimes meet in our synoptics, and the transposition of particular accounts.

3. The resemblances in the substance of the narratives are explained quite naturally by the objectivity of the facts which left its stamp on the recital; and the differences, by the involuntary modifications due to oral reproduction and to the multiplicity of written compends. There is one thing especially which is naturally accounted for in this way. We have again and again remarked, especially in the accounts of miracles, the contrast which obtains between the diversity of the historical framework in the three synoptics, and the sameness of the sayings of Jesus during the course of the action. This contrast is inexplicable if the writings are derived from one another or from a written source. It is easily understood from our view; the style of the sayings of Jesus had become more rigidly fixed in traditional narration than the external details of the Gospel scenes.

There remain the resemblances of style between the three writings—the identical clauses, the common expressions, the syntactical forms or grammatical analogies. If oral tradition became formed and formulated, as we have said, if it was early compiled in a fragmentary way, if those compilations were used by the authors of our Gospels, those resemblances no longer present anything inexplicable, and the differences which alternate with them at every instant no longer require to be explained by forced expedients. The two phenomena, which are contradictory on every other hypothesis, come into juxtaposition, and harmonize naturally.

Starting from this general point of view, let us seek to trace the special origin of each of our three synoptics. The traditions agree in ascribing to Matthew the first Gospel com-

pilation which proceeded from an apostle. It was, according to Irenæus, "at the time when Peter and Paul were together founding the church at Rome" (from 63–64), or, according to Eusebius, "when Matthew was preparing to go to preach to other nations" (after 60), that this apostle took pen in hand. This approximate date (60–64) is confirmed by the warning, in the form of a parenthesis, which we find inserted by the evangelist in the eschatological discourse of Jesus (xxiv. 15). Our Lord declares to the disciples the sign by which the Christians of Judea shall recognise the time for fleeing from the Holy Land; and Matthew adds here this remarkable *nota bene*: "*Whoso readeth, let him understand.*"[1] This parenthesis contains the proof that, when this discourse was compiled, the Judeo-Christian believers had not yet retired beyond the Jordan, as they did about the year 66. — What was the writing of Matthew? Was it a complete Gospel? The reasons which we have indicated rather lead us to think that the apostle had compiled in Aramaic the great bodies of discourses containing the doctrine of Jesus, as it had been put into form by tradition, with a view to the edification of the flocks in Palestine. It is those bodies of discourses which are the characteristic feature of our first Gospel; it is round this dominant element that the book appears to be organized all through. The narrative part is an addition to this original theme. It was not composed in Hebrew; the style does not admit of this supposition. Its date is a little later than that of the apostolic writing. For the presbyter, a native of Palestine, who instructed Papias remembered a time when, in the churches of Judæa, they had no Greek translation of the *Discourses of Jesus* (the *Logia*), and when every evangelist reproduced them in Greek *viva voce, as he could.* What hand composed this historical narrative, in the framework of which the whole contents of the *Logia* have been skilfully distributed? Is it not most natural to suppose that one of Matthew's disciples, while reproducing his *Logia* in Greek, set them in a complete narrative of the life of Jesus, and borrowed the latter from the traditional recital in such form as he had frequently

[1] This warning is not connected with the quotation from Daniel, and forms no part of the discourse of Jesus; this appears from Mark (where the quotation from Daniel is unauthentic).

heard it from the mouth of that apostle? This tradition had taken, in the hands of Matthew, that remarkably summary and concise character which we have so often observed in the first Gospel. For his aim was not to *describe* the scenes, but merely to demonstrate by facts the thesis to which his apostolic activity seems to have been devoted: Jesus is THE CHRIST. The *Logia* seems also to have been arranged with a view to this thesis: Jesus the *legislator*, Matt. v.–vii.; the *king*, chap. xiii.; the *judge*, chap. xxiv., xxv.; consequently THE MESSIAH. Comp. Matt. i. 1.

Mark, according to tradition, wrote during, or shortly after, Peter's sojourn at Rome, about 64; consequently almost at the same time as Matthew. So, like Matthew, he records in the eschatological discourse the warning which it was customary in Palestine to add to the sayings of Jesus regarding the flight beyond the Jordan (xiii. 14).—The materials of his Gospel must have been borrowed, according to tradition, from the accounts of Peter, whom Mark accompanied on his travels. Accordingly, he could not have used our first Gospel, which was not yet in existence, nor even the *Logia*, which could not yet have reached him. How, then, are we to explain the very special connections which it is easy to establish between his writing and the first Gospel? We have seen that this latter writing has preserved to us essentially the great didactic compositions which are the fruit of Matthew's labour, but set in a consecutive narrative. From whom did this narrative proceed? Indirectly from Matthew, no doubt; but in the first place from Peter, whose influence had certainly preponderated in the formation of the apostolic tradition in all that concerned the *facts* of our Lord's ministry. The only difference between the first two Gospels therefore is, that while the one gives us the apostolic system of evangelization in the summary and systematic form to which it had been reduced by the labours of Matthew, the other presents it to us in all its primitive freshness, fulness, and simplicity, as it had been heard from the lips of Peter, with the addition of one or two of the great discourses (chap. iii. and xiii.) due to the labours of Matthew (chap. xii. and xxiv.), and with which Mark had long been acquainted as a hearer of the Palestinian preaching.[1] The

[1] If Mark knew those discourses so well, he must have been acquainted with

special differences between the two compilations are explained by the variable element which is always inevitable in oral evangelization.[1] It may thus be concluded that the first Gospel contains the work of Matthew, completed by the tradition which emanated from Peter; and the second, the tradition of Peter, completed by means of some parts of Matthew's work.

Luke, according to the tradition and evidences which we have collected, must have composed his history in Greece at the same time when Matthew was compiling his *Logia* in Palestine, and Mark the narratives of Peter at Rome. If so, it is perfectly clear that he did not know and use those writings; and this is what exegesis demonstrates. From what sources, then, has he drawn? He has worked—as appears from our study of his book—on written documents, mostly Aramaic. But how are we to explain the obvious connection in certain parts between those documents and the text of the other two Syn.? It is enough to repeat that those documents, at least those which related to the ministry of Jesus from His baptism onwards, were compilations of that same apostolic tradition which forms the basis of our first two Gospels. The relationship between our three Gospels is thus explained. The Aramaic language, in which the most of Luke's documents were written, leads to the supposition that they dated, like those from which the same author composed the first part of the Acts, from the earliest times of apostolic evangelization. At that period the didactic exposition of Jesus' doctrine was probably not yet concentrated and grouped, as it was later, about some great points of time and some definite subjects. Tradition preserved many more traces of the various circumstances which had furnished our Lord with a text for His instructions. Hence those precious introductions of Luke, and that exquisite appropriateness which lends a new charm to the

the Sermon on the Mount. Its place even is clearly indicated in his narrative (between vers. 19 and 20 of chap. iii.). The only reason for his omitting this discourse must have been, that it did not fit in sufficiently to the plan of his Gospel, intended, as it was, for Gentile readers.

[1] We can understand the series of evidences by which Klostermann has been led to regard the text of Mark as merely that of Matthew enriched with *scholia* due to the narratives of Peter. But what is to be made of the series of opposing evidences which we have so often enumerated?

discourses which he has preserved to us. As to the general concatenation of the Gospel events which we admire in Luke, he owes it undoubtedly to special information. It is of such sources of information that he speaks in his prologue, and which enabled him to reconstruct that broken chain of which tradition had preserved only the rings.

Thus it is that we understand the relations and origin of the synoptics. Is this explanation chargeable with compromising the Gospel history, by making its accuracy depend on a mode of transmission so untrustworthy as tradition? Yes, if the period at which we are led to fix the compilation of those oral accounts was much more advanced. But from 60 to 65, tradition was still under the control of those who had contributed to form it, and of a whole generation contemporary with the facts related (1. Cor. xv. 6, written in 58). In those circumstances, alterations might affect the surface, not the substance of the history.

I would take the liberty of closing this important subject with an apologetic remark. There is perhaps no more decisive proof of the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus than the different forms in which they are transmitted to us by Matthew and Luke. An artificially composed discourse like those which Livy puts into the mouth of his heroes, is one utterance; but the discourses of Jesus, as they are presented to us by the two evangelists, are broken and fragmentary. Moreover, those similar materials, which appear in both in entirely different contexts, must necessarily be more ancient than those somewhat artificial wholes in which we now find them. Those identical materials put to use in different constructions must have belonged to an older edifice, of which they are merely the debris.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHURCH.

—To get rid of the Mosaic revelation, rationalism has assumed an original contrast between *Elohism* and *Jehovism*, and sought

to make the history of Israel the progressive solution of this antagonism; and in the same way, to reduce the appearing of Christianity to the level of natural events, the Tübingen School has set up a contrast between apostolic Judeo-Christianity and the Christianity of Paul,—a contrast, the gradual solution of which is made to explain the course of history during the first two centuries. Reuss and Nicolas, without altogether sharing, especially the first, in this point of view, nevertheless retain the idea of a conflict between the two fractions of the Church, profound enough to lead the author of the Acts to the belief that he must seek to disguise it by a very inaccurate exposition of the views and conduct of his master Paul. But if we cannot credit this writer in regard to things in which he took part, how are we to found on his narrative when he describes much older events, such as those which are contained in his Gospel? The importance of the question is obvious. Let us attempt, before closing, to throw light upon it.

To prove the antagonism in question, the Tübingen School in the first place advances the different tendencies which are said to be observable in the Gospels. But it is remarkable that, to demonstrate this conflict of tendencies, Baur was forced to give up the attempt of dealing with known quantities, our canonical Gospels, and to have recourse to the supposition of previous writings of a much more pronounced dogmatic character, which formed the foundation both of our Matthew and of our Luke, to wit, a primitive Matthew, exclusively legal and particularistic, and a primitive Luke, absolutely universalistic and antinomian. Thus they begin by ascribing to our Gospels an exclusive tendency; then, not finding it in the books as we have them, they make them over again according to the preconceived idea which they have formed of them. Such is the vicious circle in which this criticism moves. The hypothesis of an antinomian proto-Luke has been completely refuted within the Tübingen School itself; we may therefore leave that supposition aside. There remains only the proto-Matthew. This is the last plank to which Hilgenfeld still clings. He discovers the elements of the primitive Matthew in the fragments which remain to us of the *Gospel of the Hebrews*. He alleges a natural and gradual transformation

of this writing in the direction of universalism (the product being our canonical Matthew); afterwards Mark, and then Luke, continued and completed the transformation of the Gospel history into pure Paulinism. But this construction is not less arbitrary than that of Baur. The Gospel of the Hebrews, as we have seen, has all the characteristics of an amplified and derived work, and cannot be the basis of our Matthew. Even Volkmar treats this Judaizing proto-Matthew as a chimera, no less than the antinomian proto-Luke. And what of himself? He charges our three synoptics with being *Paulinist* writings, the sole Judaizing antagonist to which is . . . the Apocalypse. The work of John, such, according to Volkmar, is the true type of legal Judeo-Christianity, the document of which Baur seeks in vain in the primitive Matthew, which is invented by himself to meet the exigency of the case. But what! we ask Volkmar, can you regard as strictly legal a writing which calls the Jewish people *the synagogue of Satan* (Rev. iii. 9), and which celebrates with enthusiasm and in the most brilliant colours the entrance into heaven of innumerable converts *of every nation, and tribe, and people, and tongue*, who were notoriously the fruits of the labours of the Apostle Paul; which proclaims aloud the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus-Messiah, that perpetual blasphemy to the ears of the Jews; and which, instead of deriving salvation from circumcision and works, makes it descend from the throne of God and of the Lamb, of pure grace through faith *in the blood of the Lamb*, without any legal condition whatever? Such Judeo-Christianity, assuredly, is a Paulinism of pretty strong quality. And the apostle of the Gentiles would have asked nothing better than to see it admitted by all his adversaries. He would very quickly have laid down his arms.[1]

Baur further alleges the authentic epistles of Paul (the four great ones), especially the second chapter of Galatians. The

[1] Chap. ii. 29 is alleged, where a woman is spoken of who teaches to eat meats sacrificed to idols, and to commit impurity,—a woman who, it is said, represents the doctrine of Paul. But *to teach to eat* meats offered in sacrifice is *to stimulate* to the eating of them *as such*, that is to say, basely and wickedly outraging the scruples of the weak, or even with the view of escaping some disagreeable consequence, such as persecution, making profession of paganism. Now Paul, 1 Cor. x., prescribes exactly the opposite line of conduct; and as to impurity, we have 1 Cor. vi. It is libertinism and not Paulinism which is here stigmatized.

following are the contents of the passage. Paul gives an account of a *private* conference (*κατ' ἰδίαν δέ*) which he had with those of the apostles who enjoyed the highest consideration (*τοῖς δοκοῦσι*), in which he stated to them (*ἀνεθέμην*) his mode of preaching among the Gentiles,—a method which they so fully approved, that Titus, an *uncircumcised* Gentile, was immediately welcomed and treated at Jerusalem as a member of the Church (ver. 23). And if he held out in this case, though circumcision was in his view merely an external rite, and morally indifferent (1 Cor. vii. 18, 19), it was not from obstinacy, but because of *false brethren unawares brought in* (*διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους*) who claimed the right *to impose it*, and who thus gave to this matter the character of a question of principle (vers. 4, 5). Then, from those intruded false brethren, Paul returns to the apostles, whom he *contrasts* with them (*ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων*), and who, that is, the apostles, *added* no new condition to his statement (*οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο*, referring to the *ἀνεθέμην*, ver. 2), but recognised in him the man called to labour specially among the Gentiles, as in Peter the man specially charged with the apostolate to the Jews; and on this basis they associated themselves with him and his work, by giving him the *right hand of fellowship* (vers. 6–10). That there was any shade of difference between him and the Twelve, Paul does not say; we may conclude it, however, from this division of labour in which the conference terminated. But that this shade was an opposition *of principle*, and that the Twelve were radically at one with the false brethren brought in, as Baur seeks to prove, is what the passage itself absolutely denies. The contrary also appears from the second fact related by Paul in this chapter—his contention with Peter at Antioch. For when Peter ceases all at once to mingle and eat with the Christians from among the Gentiles, for what does Paul rebuke him? *For not walking uprightly*, for acting *hypocritically*, that is to say, for being unfaithful to his real conviction, which evidently assumes that Peter has the same conviction as Paul himself. And this is a passage which is to prove, according to Baur, the opposition of principle between Paul and Peter. That here again there is a shade of difference implied between Paul and Peter, and even between Peter and James ("before that certain came *from*

James"), I am not concerned to deny. But no opposition *of principle* between Peter and Paul is compatible with this account. Baur has further sought to rest his view on the enumeration of the parties formed at Corinth. According to 1 Cor. i. 12, there were believers in this city who called themselves some of Paul, some of Apollos, some of Cephas, others of Christ. Baur reasons thus: As the first two parties differed only by a shade, it must have been the same with the latter two; and as it appears from 2 Cor. x. 7, xi. 22, that those who called themselves *of Christ* were ardent Judaizers who wished to impose the law on the Gentiles, the same conviction should be ascribed to those *of Peter*, and consequently to Peter himself. But the very precise enumeration of Paul obliges us, on the contrary, to ascribe to each of the four parties mentioned a distinct standpoint; and if, as appears from 2 Cor., *those who are Christ's* are really Judaizers, enemies of Paul, the contrast between them and *those of Cephas* proves precisely that Peter and his party were not confounded with them; which corresponds with the contrast established in Gal. ii. between the *false brethren brought in* and the apostles, especially Peter. *The epistles of St. Paul*, therefore, do not in the least identify the Twelve with the Judaizers who opposed Paul; consequently they exclude the idea of any opposition *of principle* between apostolic Christianity and that of Paul.

What, then, to conclude, was the real state of things? Behind Judeo-Christianity and the Christianity of the Gentiles there is Christ, the source whence everything in the Church proceeds. This is the unity to which we must ascend. During His earthly life, Jesus personally kept the law; He even declared that He did not come to abolish, but to fulfil it. On the other hand, He does not scruple to call Himself the *Lord of the Sabbath*, to pronounce as morally null all the Levitical ordinances regarding the distinction of clean and unclean meats (Matt. xv.), to compare fasting and the whole legal system to a worn-out garment, which He is careful not to patch, because He comes rather to substitute a new one in its place. He predicted the destruction of the temple, an event which involved the abolition of the whole ceremonial system. Thus, from the example and doctrine of Jesus two opposite conclusions might be drawn, the one in

favour of maintaining, the other of abolishing, the Mosaic law. It was one of those questions which was to be solved by the dispensation of the Spirit (John xvi. 12, 13). After Pentecost, the Twelve naturally persevered in the line of conduct traced by the Lord's example; and how otherwise could they have fulfilled their mission to Israel? Yet, over against the growing obduracy of the nation, Stephen begins to emphasize the latent spirituality of the Gospel. There follow the foundation of the church of Antioch and the first mission to the Gentiles. Could the thought be entertained of subjecting those multitudes of baptized Gentiles to the system of the law? The apostles had not yet had the opportunity of pronouncing on this point. For themselves, and for the converts among the Jews, they kept up the Mosaic rites as a national institution which must continue till God Himself should free them from its yoke by some positive manifestation or by the return of the Messiah; but as to the Gentiles, they probably never thought of imposing it upon them. The question had no sooner occurred, than God enlightened them by the vision of Peter (Acts x.). But they were not absolute masters at Jerusalem. There there were many *priests* and elders of the Pharisees (Acts vi. 7, xv. 5) who professed faith in Jesus Christ, and who, from the height of their rabbinical science and theological erudition, regarded the apostles with a sort of disdain. On the one hand, they were pleased with the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles; the God of Israel was thereby becoming the God of the Gentiles, and the whole world was accepting the moral sovereignty of the children of Abraham. But, in order that the end might be fully attained, and their ambition satisfied, it was of course necessary that the new converts should be incorporated with Israel, and that with baptism they should receive circumcision. Only on this condition was the widespread proselytism of Paul acceptable to them. "If I preach circumcision," says Paul, alluding to this class, "*the offence of the cross is ceased*" (Gal. v. 11). That is to say, if only I granted them circumcision, they would concede to me even the cross. It is easy to understand why Paul calls them *false brethren, intruders* into the Church.

There were thus really two distinct camps among the

Christians of Jewish origin, according to the book of Acts as well as according to Paul himself: those who made circumcision in the case of Gentile converts a condition of salvation; and those who, while preserving it in the case of themselves and their children as a national observance, exempted the Gentiles from its obligation (comp. especially Acts vi. 7, xi. 2, xv. 1–5, 24, with xi. 18, 22, 23; xv. 10, 11, 19–21, with Gal. ii.). This last passage, which Baur has used to prove that the narrative of the Acts was a pure romance, on the contrary confirms the contents of Luke's account at every point. At the public assembly described by Luke, to which Paul alludes when relating the private conference (*κατ' ἰδίαν δέ*, Gal. ii. 2) which he had with the apostles, it was decided: 1*st.* That converts from among the Gentiles were not at all subject to circumcision and the law; 2*d.* That the *status quo* was maintained for Judeo-Christians (no one exacted the contrary); 3*d.* That, to facilitate union between the two different elements of which the Church was composed, the Gentiles should accept certain restrictions on their liberty, by abstaining from various usages which were peculiarly repugnant to Jewish national feeling. These restrictions are nowhere presented as a matter of salvation; the words, "*Ye shall do well*," prove that all that is intended is a simple counsel,[1] but one the observance of which is nevertheless *indispensable* (*ἐπάναγκες*) for the union of the two parties. Thus presented, they could perfectly well be accepted by Paul, who, in case of necessity, would have admitted, according to Gal. ii., even the circumcision of Titus, if it had been demanded of him on this understanding. But there remained in practice difficulties which certainly were not foreseen, and which were not long in appearing. For Palestine, where the Judeo-Christians formed churches free from every Gentile element, the compromise of Jerusalem was sufficient. But where, as at Antioch, the Church was mixed, composed of Jewish elders and Gentile elders, how fettered did the daily relations still remain

[1] Zeller attempts to translate *εὖ πράξετε* by: "Ye shall be saved." These words can only signify: "ye shall do well," or, "it shall go well with you." As to the term *πορνία*, we think that it is to be taken in its natural sense, and that this vice is here brought into prominence in so strange a way, because, in the eyes of so many Gentiles, it passed for a thing as indifferent as eating and drinking (1 Cor. vi. 12, 13).

between parties, the one of whom professed to remain strictly faithful to legal observances, while the others polluted themselves every instant in the eyes of the former by contact with unclean objects and the use of meats prepared without any regard to Levitical prescriptions! How, in such circumstances, was it possible to celebrate feasts in common,—the Agapæ, for example, which preceded the Holy Supper? When Peter arrived at Antioch, he was obliged to decide and to trace for himself his line of conduct. If he remained literally faithful to the letter of the compromise of Jerusalem, there was an end to the unity of the Church in that city where the gospel was flourishing. His heart carried him. He decided for the opposite view. He set himself to live with the Gentiles, and to eat as they did (Gal. ii. 14). But thereupon there arrived emissaries from James, the man who, in the great assembly, had proposed the compromise. They demonstrated to Peter that, according to the terms of this arrangement, he was in fault, because, as a Jew, he should not dispense with the observance of the law; Barnabas himself had nothing to answer. They submitted, and withdrew from intercourse with the Gentiles. The fact was, that the compromise had not anticipated the case of mixed churches, in which the two elements could unite only on one condition: that *Jewish Christians* on their side should renounce part of their legal observances. We can easily understand, even from this point of view, why St. Paul, in his letters, did not insist on this decree, which left so grave a practical difficulty untouched.

There prevailed, therefore, not *two* points of view, as Baur alleges, but four at least: 1*st.* That of the ultra-legalists, the *Judaizers* properly so called, who perpetuated the law as a principle in the gospel. 2*d.* That of the *Twelve* and of the moderate Judeo-Christians, who personally observed the law as an obligatory ordinance, but not at all as a condition of salvation, for in that case they could not have released the Gentiles from it. Among them there existed two shades: that of Peter, who thought he might subordinate obedience to the law in mixed churches to union with the Gentile party; and that of James, who wished to maintain the observance of law even in this case, and at the expense of union. 3*d.* *Paul's* point of view, according to which the keeping of the law was

a matter morally indifferent, and consequently optional, *even in the case of Judeo-Christians*, according to the principle which he expresses: "*To them that are under the law, as under the law; to them that are without the law, as without law; all things to all men, that I might save the more*" (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21). *4th.* Finally, an *ultra-Pauline* party, which is combated by the Apocalypse and by Paul himself (1 Cor. viii. and x.; Rom. xiv.), which ridiculed the scruples of the weak, and took pleasure in braving the dangers of idolatrous worship, and thus came to excuse the most impure excesses (1 Cor. vi.; Rev. ii. 20). The two extreme points of view differed *in principle* from the intermediate ones. But the latter differed only on a question of ceremonial observance in which, as was recognised on both sides, salvation was not involved. We may put the difference in this form: the conscience of Paul derived this emancipation from the law from the first coming of Christ, while the Twelve expected it only at His second coming.

What has this state of things, so nicely shaded, in common with the flagrant antithesis to which Baur attempts to reduce this whole history? As if in such moral revolutions there was not always a multitude of intermediate views between the extremes! Let the time of the Reformation be considered: what a series of view-points from Luther, and then Melancthon on to the ultra-spiritualists (the *Schwarmgeister*), without reckoning all the shades in the two camps catholic and philosophical!

But after having established, in opposition to Baur, the general trustworthiness of the description given by the author of the Acts, must we abandon Luke to the criticisms of Reuss and Nicolas, leaving him charged by the first with instances of "conciliatory reticence," and by the second "with a well-marked desire to bring the views of St. Paul into harmony with those of the Judaizing [apostles]"? The ground for those charges is especially the account Acts xxi. James declares to Paul, who has just arrived at Jerusalem, that he has been calumniated to the Judeo-Christians of Palestine, having it said of him that he seeks everywhere to lead his Jewish converts *to forsake Moses;* and to prove the falsehood of this accusation, Paul agrees to carry out the Nazarite vow

in the temple with four Judeo-Christians. But in what is this conduct, which the author of the Acts ascribes to Paul, contrary to the apostle's principles as he lays them down in his epistles? Did Paul ever in any place act the fanatical destroyer of the legal economy? Can a case be cited in which he sought to prevail on a Jewish Christian not to circumcise his children? He resolutely refused to allow the yoke of the law to be imposed on the Gentiles; but did he ever seek to make a Jew throw it off? At Antioch, even, would he have censured Peter as he does, if the latter had not previously adopted an entirely different mode of acting (Gal. ii. 14–18)? Did not Paul himself practise the principle: *to them who are under the law, as under the law?* He could therefore in good earnest, as Luke relates, seek to prove to the Judeo-Christians of Palestine that he was moved by no feeling of hostility to the law, and that he was far from teaching the Jews scattered over Gentile lands to abjure the law and *forsake Moses.*

The fundamental error of that whole view which we are combating, is its mistaking more or less the powerful unity which lies at the foundation of the Church. What would be said of a historian who should allege that the Reformation proceeded from the conflict between the Lutheran Church and the Reformed, and who should overlook the essential unity which was anterior to that division? Is it not committing the same error to make the Church proceed from a reconciliation of Judeo-Christianity with Paulinism? But have not those two currents, supposing them to be as different as is alleged, a common source which men affect to lay aside, namely, Jesus Christ? Is this question of the law, on which division took place, the grand question of the N. T.? Is not its place secondary in comparison with that of faith in Christ? Was it not accidentally, and on occasion of the practical realization of the postulates of faith, that the question of the law emerged? And how then could the antagonism which manifested itself on this head be the starting-point of the new creation? Baur, in order to escape the true starting-point, conceives an original antagonism between two extreme tendencies, which gradually approximated, and ended, in virtue of reciprocal concessions, by uniting and forming the great

Catholic Church at the end of the second century. We shall oppose history to history, or rather history to romance, and we shall say: In Christ the Spirit remained enveloped in the form of the letter. The Church was founded; within its bosom a tendency continued for a time to keep up the letter *by the side* of the Spirit; the other was already prepared to sacrifice the letter to the free unfolding of the Spirit. But they were at one on this point, that for both life was only in the Spirit. From both sides there went off extreme parties, as always happens, Judaizers to the right, Antinomians to the left; on the one hand, Nazarite and Ebionite communities landing in the *Clementine Homilies*, which sought to combine Paul and Simon Magus in one and the same person; on the other, the Antinomian exaggerations of the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, and even of that to Diognetus, terminating at length in Marcion, who believed the God of the Jewish law to be a different one from that of the gospel. Between those extremes the Church, more and more united from the time that the destruction of Jerusalem had levelled every ceremonial difference between Judeo-Christians and Gentiles, continued its march; and while casting forth from its bosom Ebionism on the one side, and Marcionism on the other, it closed its ranks under the fire of persecution, and became the *great Church*, as it is already named by Celsus. Let the documents be studied impartially, and it will be seen whether this picture is not more true to fact than that of Baur.[1]

And what place, finally, do our four Gospels occupy in this whole? They do not represent four different epochs or four distinct parties. They each represent one of the sides of Christ's glory unveiled to one of the apostles.

The hour of revelation to which the second Gospel belongs is previous to the death and resurrection of Jesus; it is the

[1] M. Reuss attaches great importance to the hospitality which Paul meets with in the Roman Church (Phil. i.), and to the almost complete abandonment which he has to endure a little later (2 Tim. iv.). But the first passage merely furnishes the proof that the event which Paul had for a long time been expecting (Rom. xvi. 17-20)—the arrival of the *Judaizers* at Rome—had taken place. As to the second event, it cannot (if the 2d Epistle to Timothy is authentic, as we believe it to be, with M. Reuss) have taken place till a second captivity, and after the persecution of Nero had temporarily dispersed the Roman Church. It proves no antipathy whatever on the part of this Church to the apostle.

enlightenment of St. Peter, as indicated by Jesus Himself, when, following up the apostle's profession: "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of God,*" He answers, "*Flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*" The divine greatness of Jesus, as it was displayed during the course of His earthly life,—such is the idea which fills, penetrates, and inspires the Gospel of Mark.

The time when that inspiration was born which gave rise to the first Gospel came later; it occurs in the interval between the resurrection and ascension. It is the time thus described by Luke (xxiv. 45): "*Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures.*" Christ, the fulfilment of the law and of prophecy,—such is the discovery which the Spirit made to the apostles in that hour of illumination; the theocratic past stood out before them in the light of the present, the present in the light of the past. This is the view which impelled Matthew to take the pen, and dictated the writing which bears his name.

The inspiring breath of the third Gospel dates from the times which followed Pentecost. St. Paul marks this decisive moment with emotion, when he says to the Galatians (i. 15, 16): "*When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb . . . to reveal His Son Jesus Christ in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles.*" Christ, *the hope of glory* to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews; Christ, the Son of God given to the world, and not merely the son of David granted to Israel;—such was the view contemplated by Paul during those three days in which, while his eyes were closed to the light of this world, his soul opened to a higher light. This light with which St. Paul was illuminated passed into the work of Luke; thence it rays forth constantly within the Church.

The lot of John fell to him last; it was the most sublime. "*The Spirit shall glorify me,*" Jesus had said; "*He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you, and He will show you things to come.*" Here was more than the work of a day or an hour; it was the work of a whole life. In its prolonged meditations, his profound and self-collected heart passed in review the sayings which had gone forth from the mouth of that Master on whose bosom he had

rested, and discovered in them the deepest mystery of the faith, the eternal divinity of the Son of man, the *Word made flesh*, God in Christ, Christ in us, we through Christ in God; such, in three words, are the contents of John's writings, especially of his Gospel. This view of the relation between God, Christ, and believers, laid down in the fourth Gospel, is alone capable of raising the Church to its full height.

In those four rays there is contained all the glory of Christ. What He was in His visible presence, what He is in relation to the theocratic past, what He is in relation to the religious future of the whole world, what He is in regard to the eternal union of every man with the infinite principle of things,—such is the discovery which the Church has before her in those four writings. Were she to deprive herself of one of them, she would only impair the honour of her Head, and impoverish herself. May the Church therefore rather be the focus within which those four rays perpetually converge, and in which they again become one, as they were one originally in the life of the Head!

END OF VOL. II.

MURRAY AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018